

THE STRUCTURE
OF THE
ASHTADHYAYI

By

I S Pawate, M A , LL B

The Shridhar Ramakrishna Bhandarkar
Prizeman in Vyākaraṇa (1934), of the
University of Bombay

PRICE Rs 2/-

To
My Father

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author has great pleasure in acknowledging his indebtedness to Dr S^r K. Belvalkar M A, Ph D, for the uniform encouragement he received from him while he was working on the Thesis at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Thanks are also due to the members on the staff of the B O R Institute for extending to the author every facility for study.

The author is highly obliged to Mr V Y Jathar, B Sc, of the Karnatak Printing Works, for the neat and prompt execution of the work.

The Author

INTRODUCTION

The reader will see that throughout my essay on the Structure of the *A-tādhyāyī*, I have mainly relied on the *Kāś'ikā* and the *Nyāsa*, a commentary on the former. The importance of the *Kāś'ikā* cannot be over rated. It is the only exhaustive, lucid, scientific, authoritative and ancient commentary on the *A-tādhyāyī*. The *Kāś'ikā* is generally supposed to have been written in the seventh century A. D. But I think that the *Kāś'ikā* cannot have been written later than the second century of the Christian era.

I

To determine the date of the *Kāś'ikā* scholars have up till now relied mainly upon Itsing's account. But, in this connection, it is to be noted that

1. Itsing speaks of a '*Vṛttisūtra*'. This *Vṛttisūtra* has been turned by some scholars into '*Sūtravṛtti*', which has been conjecturally identified with the *Kāś'ikā*.

2. Itsing says that the *Vṛttisūtra* teaches about the laws of the universe. This description does not at all apply to the *Kāś'ikā*.

3. Itsing mentions one Jayāditya as the author of the *Vṛttisūtra*. Now the *Kāś'ikā* is the work of two joint authors Vāmana and Jayāditya. Why is Itsing silent about Vāmana, if he meant the *Kāś'ikā* by the word '*Vṛttisūtra*'?

4. Itsing says that Patanjali wrote a commentary on the *Vṛttisūtra*. It is evident that the *Vṛttisūtra* commented upon by Patanjali can by no stretch of imagination be identified with the *Kāś'ikā*. It is interesting to note that Patanjali

speaks of a 'Vṛttisūtra' in his Bhāṣya, on वार्तिक 24 (दुष्प्राख्यानेषु च) on S. II. 1. 1 (नमर्थः पदविधिः). Patanjali says: न भ्रमो दृष्टि-सूत्रवचनप्रामाण्यादिति । किं तर्हि वार्तिकवचनप्रामाण्यादिति ।*

Thus we may say, with Dr Belvalkar, that Itsing's account may (does) not after all refer to the Kās'ikā.

II

THE JAINENDRA VYĀKARAṆA AND THE KĀS'IKĀ

Dr K. B. Pathak says (Ind. Antiquary 43 p. 210) that the authors of the Kās'ikā knew the Jainendra Sūtra 'हस्तादेये दुपस्तेये चैः' II iii, 36. He has based his conclusion on the Kās'ikā on P III iii, 40

हस्तादाने चैस्तेये ।

Kās'ikā :— हस्तादाने गम्यमाने चिनोतिषांतोः षञ् प्रत्ययो भवति । न चैस्तेये चौर्यं भवति । ... उच्यस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः ॥

It is contended that the authors of the Kās'ikā refer to the Jainendrasūtra 'हस्तादेयेऽनुदि अस्तेये चैः' in the sentence 'उच्यस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः'. But it is also possible that the author of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa himself based his sūtra on the sentence of the Kās'ikā—उच्यस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः ।

Let us turn to the Kās'ikā on P. V iii 101 & 102.

वस्तुर्दृञ् ॥ 101

Kās'ikā :— इवेत्यनुवर्तते - । वस्तिशब्दादिवार्यं दृञ् प्रत्ययो भवति । दम्तिरिव वास्तेयः वास्तेयी ।

शिलाया दः ॥ 102.

Kās'ikā :— शिलाशब्दादिवार्यं दः प्रत्ययो भवति । शिलेव शिलेयं दधि । केचिदत्र दन्मयीच्छन्ति । तदर्थं योगविभागाः कर्तव्यः । शिलाया दञ् प्रत्ययो भवति । शिलेयम् ॥ ततो दः । शिलेयम् ॥

The authors of the *kāśikā* propose to break S 102, into two sūtras, गिडायाः and दः, to provide for the form गीडेयम्, because केचिदत्र दृश्यमस्ति. Thus the authors of the *Kāśikā* propose to read the present sūtras वग्नेदम् and गिडाया दः as follows :—

1. वग्नेदम् ।
2. गिडायाः [दम्] ।
3. दः [गिडायाः] ।

Now, to whom does the *Kāśikā* refer with the word केचिद्, in “केचिदत्र दृश्यमस्ति” ? Dr. K. B. Pathak thinks that the reference is to the following sūtras of Jainendra :—

वग्नेदम् ॥ IV. 1. 207
गिडायाः ॥ 208
दम् ॥ 209

But these Jainendrasūtras seem to have been framed by taking the hint given by the *Kāśikā* : तदर्थं योगविभागः वग्नेदः । गिडायाः । दम् प्रत्ययो भवति । गीडेयम् । ततो दः । गीडेयम् ॥

Then to whom does the *Kāśikā* refer in the sentence “केचिदत्र दृश्यमस्ति” ? We think the reference is to the Cāndras. वग्नेदम् ॥ Cāndra Sūtra IV. iii. 79.

गिडाया दम् ॥ 80.

Cāndra Vṛtti:— गिडाया इत्यर्थे वग्नेदमाया दौ भवति दम् च । गिडेयं दहि । गीडेयम् ॥

It is well known that the authors of the *Kāśikā* have extensively drawn upon the Cāndra Vyākaraṇa.*

III

What is the name of the author of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa ? What is the name of the author of the Pāpīyā ?

* “.....des Kaśikā die je themselves d'esse Mère au Candra malit aufgenommen hat, ob-e d e Quelle zu kennen.....”

Pāṇini, of the Āpiś'ala Vyākaraṇa? Āpiś'ali, of that of the Cāndra Vyākaraṇa? Cāndra. So also, what is the name of the author of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa? Jinendra. जिनेन्द्र प्रोक्तं जैनेन्द्रम् । Now the author of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa is generally known as Devanandin. Thus the author of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa was known by two names—Jinendra and Devanandin.

IV

The Nyāsa, the earliest extant commentary on the Kāś'ikā is by Jinendra Buddhi.

Now let us turn to the Sravanabelgola Inscription No. 64 (1163 A. D.) There we read—

यो देवनन्दिप्रथमाभिधानो बुद्ध्या महत्या स जिनेन्द्रबुद्धिः ।
श्रीपूज्यपादीजननि देवताभिर्यत्पूजितं पादपुगं यदीयम् ॥

So Devanandin, Jinendrabuddhi and Pūjyapāda are three names for one and the same person.

Now, Poona, a great Kannada poet who wrote his *maṇi śaṅkara* (Śāntipurāṇa) in 933 A. D., speaks of the 'revered Nyāsa-kāra' as a very lucid commentator,* and invokes the blessings of Pūjyapāda in the beginning of his Śāntipurāṇa † Vṛttavilāsa (1160 A. D.) says that the great ascetic Pūjyapāda “*ಶ್ರೀಮಃ ಪೂಜ್ಯಪಾದಃ ಪಾಶಾಢ ಪಿಪ್ಪಲಾದಿಪದ್ಧತಿಪ್ರಾಕಾರೈಃ*” wrote the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa and a commentary on the

Pāṇinīya". Thus it is evident that Devanandin alias Jinen drabudohi alias Pūjyapāda was the author of the Jainend a Vyakarana and the Nyāsa

In the first edition of the first volume of the Karnataka Kavicharite Mahāmabopādhyāya R. Narasimhacharya placed Pūjyapāda in about 470 A. D. In the revised edition (1931) of the book he places Pūjyapāda in about 600 A. D. But in his letter to me dated 21-12-1933 he says that Pūjyapāda is to be placed somewhere about 450 A. D. And the date seems to be the correct one because, Bana in his Haravarsa's written in the reign of Haravardhana (606-649) refers to the Nyāsa in the following passage —

तत्तन्त्रा बाणस्य चत्वार विद्वत्पुत्रा चान्न प्रमत्तदत्तयो गृहीत
वाक्या त्वत्पुत्रदत्तपामा म्यापयादिन एतत्तमप्रज्ञान्यामगुरुरा व्यपमातुत्त
लोक इव व्याकरणेति ।

If the author of the Nyāsa lived about 450 A. D., the Āvśikā which was an old work at the time of the author of the Nyāsa * must go back to somewhere about the beginning of the Christian era.

The following is the relevant portion of the text of Mahāmabopādhyāya R. Narasimhacharya's kind letter to me

PRATYAKA VIMARSA VICHARADHANA
KARNATAKA PRACHYA VIDYA VATHHAVA

Rao Bahadur

R. NARASIMHACHARYA M.A. M.F.S.

MAHESWARAY
BANGALORE

2-12-1933

ಹೇಳಿಕೆ. ಈಚೆಗೆ ದೈನಂದಿಕ ಜೀವನದ ಸಂಪರ್ಕವೂ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಾಲು ಹೋಗಿರುವುದು. Indian Antiquary for 1913, P 204 ನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ. ಈತನ ವಿಷಯವು ವಜ್ರನಂದಿಯ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಪ್ರಮಾಣವು ಸಂಬಂಧವಾದುದೋ ಅಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬ ಸಂದೇಹವುಂಟಾಯಿತು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ೨ನೆಯ ಮುದ್ರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿದೆ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಅದೇಚನೆಮಾಡಿದುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂಜ್ಯರಾದನ ಕಾಲವು ೪ನೆಯ ಅಗರಬಹುಮೆಂದು ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. Indian Antiquary 43, P 211 ನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರಕರು ಇಂಥ ಕಾಲನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಜ್ರನಂದಿಯ ಕಾಲವು ನಿಜವಾಗಿದ್ದರಬಹುದು.

೨. ಜೈನೇಂದ್ರ ಪೂಜ್ಯರಾದನ ಸೂತ್ರಗಳು ಕಾಶಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅದ್ವೈತವಾಗಿವೆ ಎಂಬ ನನ್ನ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗೆ ಮಾರಕರೇ ಅಧಾರ. ಅವರು Indian Antiquary 43, P 210ರಲ್ಲಿ "ಹಸ್ತಪ್ರೇಮೇಶ್ವರಾಚಾರ್ಯರೇ ಬರೆ" ಎಂಬ ಜೈನೇಂದ್ರಸೂತ್ರವು (II, 3, 36) ಕಾಶಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಿಕಾರರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿತ್ತೆಂದೂ; ಅಲ್ಲದೆ "ಪತ್ರೇಶ್ವರ" (IV, 1 207) ವಿಲಾಸ (IV, 1, 208), ಭ ವ (IV, 1, 209) ಎಂಬ ಜೈನೇಂದ್ರದ ಮೂರು ಸೂತ್ರಗಳೂ ಕಾಶಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ "ಕೇಶವಪ್ರಭಾಕರಮುನೀಶ್ವರ" ಎಂದಾರಂಭಿಸುವ ವಾಕ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಬಂಧವಾಗಿವೆ ಎಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ವಿವರವನ್ನು Indian Antiquary ಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಯಬಹುದು.

ಇಂತೀ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸನೆ

Sd./ ಡಾ. ನರಸಿಂಹಾಚಾರ್ಯ.

To,

L S PAWATE, Esq B A., LL B
PLEADER, HUBLI.

PART I

पाणिनिना प्रोक्तं पाणिनीयम्

Sanskrit fettered by the grammar of Panini. We read this interesting piece of dialogue in the Mahabhasya -

कश्चिद् वैयाकरण आह - कास्य रयस्य प्रवेनेति । सूत आह, अहं मायुमनस्य प्राजितेति । वैयाकरण आह - अपशब्द इति । सूत आह - प्राप्तिज्ञो देवानां प्रियः । न त्विष्टिज्ञः । इत्यत एतद् रूपम् इति ॥ १५ ६७,

प्रदीप - प्राप्तिज्ञ इति । सर्वत्रोभयं प्राप्ति भवान् जानाति । न त्वावायानाम् इष्टिम् इत्यथ ।

We think that a system of grammar the students of which have such ideas about its function and extent of authority, cannot be accused of having checked the natural growth of the language. We should rather say that the Paninian system allowed full growth to the language while it was living and checked its deterioration, when Sanskrit was being slowly thrown into the back ground by Pali and other vernaculars at the rise of Buddhism.

This system of Panini consists of three interdependent works, viz, the Dhatupatha, the Ganapatha, and Sutrapatha. And we shall consider them in the following chapters.

CHAPTER II. DHATUPATHA.

What it is - The Dhatupatha is a list of dhatus or roots. The various schools of Sanskrit grammar seem to have had their own separate Dhatupaths. The students of the grammar of Apisala, one of the predecessors of Panini, the Apisalas had their own Dhatupatha, and Patanjali tells us according to this Dhatupatha the root अम् was simply अ् the अ् as seen in forms like अस्मि and गच्छीमस् being simply augments.

As regards the Paninian Dhatupatha we must note at the outset that originally the meanings of roots were not given in Dhatupatha; but were added later by Bhimaseṇi; and that originally there was संहितापाठ of roots and they were not separated from each other.†

It seems that the Paninians themselves had their Dhatupatha in more than one version. The existing Dhatupatha begins with the root भू, but Patanjali seems to speak of another version also in which the अदादिस began with the root

*नमचग्रविन्यः इव. | I. iii 22.

या | धाटः स्व प्रतिज्ञानं इति दक्षव्यं । या ।

गायं — आह स्वः पतिज्ञानं इति वक्ष्य्यं अस्मि मकारमतेष्वे । गाय मी गुणवृद्धी आनिषन्ते । विवर्तौ गुणवृद्धी आनिषन्ते । This passage has been incorporated into the Kāśī, & the Nyāsa commenting thereon says - मकारमस्मि धातुमापिशङ्किराचार्यं पतिजानीते । P 223

Also Padamanjari.

आपिशङ्का अस्मभूतानीति यानु मकारमात्रं प्रतिज्ञानं ॥

Quoted in Ns. Ed. Mb. Bh. Vol II. P 162.

† Vide Bhashya on या । परिमाणं ग्रहणेन । on S I iii 1 and

Kaṣyapa and Nagesha thereon

यं that is, in which the present -इति ईs were गीदिस, and in which the गीदिस and not the गीदिस were placed at the beginning of the Dhātupāṭha† And this will not seem surprising when we remember that the Pāṇinians were a vast school and were divided among themselves according as they were easterners or westerners (cf. Kāśka VI n 104). But at present we have only one version of the Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha and the other seems to have been irrecoverably lost. From Kāśka to Bhattoji all the commentators comment on one and the same version of the Dhātupāṭha and that version is the version we have.

Its relation to the Aśadhyaṣya

Now let us turn to the Aśadhyaṣya and consider its relation to the Dhātupāṭha.

When reading the Siddhānta Kūmudī we are apt to be misled by the place and treatment accorded to the Dhātupāṭha in it, into thinking that the Dhātupāṭha is merely an appendix to the Aśadhyaṣya. So Apté in his Dictionary says that the Dhātupāṭha is supposed to be the work of Pāṇini himself, “as supplementary to his sūtras

१ भूगदयः कान्तः I m 1

भाष्यम् - अथैव चादिशब्दः परिसमाप्तये। भूगदय इति वादय इति नयदा नावत् क्रियावचना धातुस्त्वेष पक्षः तदा भू इत्यत्र य आदिशब्दः स व्यवस्थाया वर्तते। वा इत्यत्र य आदिशब्दः स प्रकारे भू इत्येवमादयः य इत्येव प्रकारा इति। [Refers to the Dh. P. we have] यदा तु भूगदय पचनी धातु इत्येष पक्षः तदा वेत्यत्र य आदिशब्दः स व्यवस्थाया वर्तते। भू इत्यत्र य आदिशब्दः स प्रकारे। वेत्येवमादयः भू इत्येव प्रकारा इति। [Refers to the lost version of the Dh. P.]

निवृत्तिर्भवति । न चास्यैव श्रुत्युपाय उपस्थितः । येषां पठ्यन्ते तेषामपि
विपर्यासनिवृत्त्यर्थः । तत्र हि कृष्यर्थं कर्म प्रयुज्यते । इत्यर्थः च श्रुतिः ।

Thus the Dha. P. is not strictly speaking an appendix to the Aṣṭadhyāyī, as it contains much matter not necessary for the purposes of the Aṣṭadhyāyī. Kaṣyapa tells us that it was meant to be an exhaustive list of all the roots in the Sanskrit language.

The author of the Dhatupatha.

Who is the author of the Dhatupatha? Most of us would readily answer "Panini, the author of the Aṣṭadhyāyī". Such is the common belief, that has been current for some centuries. The Bṛhasaparaṇi ११५. —

अनुवृत्तान्तरे ऋषिर्वाणिनिः स्वगृहे यथा ।

सुनपाठं धातुपाठं गणपाठं तद्वचनम् ।

लिखितं तदा कृत्वा परम् निर्याणमाप्तवान् ।

The Sūtra speaks of Panini as the author of the whole of the Vyākaraṇa "कृत्स्नं व्याकरणम्" and this whole must evidently include the Dhatupatha. At the end of the existing Dh. P. we find the colophon इति श्रोतृपाणिनिमुनिप्रणीतं धातुपाठः समाप्तः । Goldstucker says (p. 182) that Panini is the author of the groundwork of the existing Dhatupatha. "The Dh. P." says Keith, Hist. of Sanskrit Lit. (1930) p. 430, goes back in substance to Panini. And Liebh in 1930, describes the Kaṣyapa raṅgini on the title page of his edition of that work as "Kaṣyapa's Kommentar zu Paninis Dhatupatha."

We submit this belief is not free from doubts

Cf. भाष्यम्. पाठेन धातुसंज्ञेत्येदुषपन्नम् भवति ।

पक्षीय.— पाठेनेति । ये धातुपाठे पठितास्तेषामेव धातुपक्षः । तेषां पाठो नास्ति कश्चाद्यपि इत्युक्त्यानिर्वादनार्थः । S. I. iii. 1.

The word *dhatu* itself is well known to be told by the Kasika, a term borrowed by Panini from his predecessors it was they who gave the name of *dhatu* to the क्रियावचन or verbs and Panini having borrowed the word from his predecessors uses it in the sense in which it was used by them.

The word *dhatu* is derived from the root धा, by adding the Unadi termination लन् (172) Yaska says धातुर्दधानः. So the etymological sense of the word is "that which sustains that which underlies." Amara describes a *dhatu* as द्वाद्यनि or source of words. Now this description of Amara and the etymological meaning of the word *dhatu* show that the battle between the Nairuktas and the वैयाकरणानां चक referred to by Yaska in the famous passage of his Nirukta had been decisively won by Sakatayana and the Niruktas, and already Acharya is before us. Panini seems to have taken the view that the नामानि धातुना दद्यान्ते and so dubbed the क्रियावचन or verbs as *dhatu*s.

Before coming to such a momentous conclusion they must have studied the nature of verbs or *akhayas* thoroughly by collecting them steadily and following each root into all its derivatives to be found in the Sanskrit language. For this purpose they must have collected all the available roots in one place. We have seen above that the Dhatupatha is not a mere appendix to the Asti, that it contains much matter that is useless for the purposes of the Asti and that it was meant to be an exhaustive list of all the roots in the

१ धातुना पूर्वार्थे भूतः । ते च क्रियावचनानि यानि दृश्यन्ते ।
 नदिहपि पुरा वायमगाथयणार क्रियावचनमत्र भूतानी धातुना
 विधीयते । ha ha I in I.

Sanskrit language. Why we suggest that this is due to the fact that the collection of all the क्रियावचन, in one book, that is, the composition of the Dh P was the work of those grammarians who, with Sakatayana, held that all the nouns were derived from verbs, and that the verbs were the primal elements or *dhatus* or sustainers of the whole structure of language? Does it not seem highly probable that the Dhatupatha was meant to serve the purposes not only of the student of grammar, but also those of the student of words on the lines laid down in the Nirukta? If the Dhatupatha is to serve such a double purpose, it is evident that it should contain every root in the language, whether regular or irregular whether strictly necessary for the purposes of a student of grammar or no. So we think that the Dhatupatha is the work of Nirukta-Vaiyakarinas of the type of the great Sakatayana.

Now let us see whether Pāṇini was a grammarian of the type of Sakatayana. If he was of that type then it is possible that the Dhatupatha is his work. But if it is found that Pāṇini held with Gargya, and the वैयग्रहणा चक्रे referred to by Yaska in his Nirukta that not all the nouns are derived from verbal roots then much of the existing Dhatupatha would become worse than useless for him, and we think he should not be fathered to a work, which was the child of an opponent school of thought.

There is very strong evidence to show that Pāṇini with Gargya held the *atyaṣṭhali* theory of nouns. Patanjali commenting on the Varṇa — नाम च धनुःमाह निदधे व्यग्रहणं निदधस्य च तच्छब्दम् on 5.3.31 उणादयः बहुलम्, 5.3.32 वैयग्रहणा च तच्छब्दायन आह धानुः नमेति. It is significant that Pāṇini also is not merely a holder of the theory. He is a worker of it. (निरुक्तिः)

This conclusion is strengthened when we consider the way in which the Astl refers to the Dhātupatha. The first distinct reference to the Dhātupatha as a whole occurs in I iii 1&2, भूवादयो धातवः & उपदेशेननुनासिक इत्. The word *upadesa* is to be noted. The Astl always refers to the Dh P as a whole with the word *upadesa*. As to the exact meaning of the word there has raged a controversy between the प्राचीनस & the नव्यस. The Kaśika says — उपदिश्यते अनेनेति उपदेशः शास्त्रवाक्यानि सूत्रपाठः तिलपाठश्च Ny 151 — उपदेश इति वरणे षत् । तिलपाठः धातुपाठः. And according to the प्राचीनकारिका referred to in the Bāhmanoṣmī, by the word *upadesa* are meant —

धातुसूत्रगणोणादिव्याक्यलिङ्गानुसृतनम् । आगमप्रत्ययादश्च

Upadesa, according to the S K is आयाचारनम्*. This definition of उपदेश given by the S K seems to have been based upon the dictum of Kaśika — यथा तु स्वरूपज्ञानाय अपूर्वमुच्यते तेषामेव उपदेशम्यमहार । VI i 15 अथैव उपदेशेति

Leaving alone the *practises* and the *archaisms* to fight amongst themselves, let us turn from their wordy battle to the Astl itself and see what the Astl refers to with the word *upadesa*. The word *upadesa* occurs nine times in the Astl and let us consider all these nine cases

1 उपदेशेननुनासिक इत् । I iii 2

Here the word *upadesa*, includes the Dhātupatha

2 आदिच उपदेशेति । VI i 45

The word *upadesa* in this case, refers only to the Dhātupatha

* cf Bāhman उक्तं राजचर्क. निरिदधारवक्रियायाम् । नारे षम् ।

and that the author of the Aśid got the Dh P handed down to him as *Upad* sa from a series of earlier Acharyas.

We have seen above that Patanjali speaks of two versions of the Paninian Dhatupatha. It is probable that Panini received both the versions from his आचार्यः. It is perhaps due to some partiality shown by Panini and Katyana and Patanjali for the version beginning with the root मू, that it only has come down to us. We shall later on show that Panini received from his predecessors the सर्वादिगण in two versions.

That there were two versions of the Dh P is supported by the fact that some references to particular गण by some sūtras in the अष्टाध्यायी are not found in the present Dh P. For instance, S पिदिदृदिभ्याद् (III iii 104) refers to the मिदिदिगण. But there is no मिदिदिगण in the present version of the Dh P. The Kaśikā says — (प्रातिपदिक-)गणपठितेषु मिदिदिषु निवृत्त्य प्रवृत्त्या नृन्ते । It is rather strange that the word पिदि should refer to the Dh P and the next word मिदिदि to the प्रातिपदिकपाठ or the गणपाठ. If the reference is to the गणपाठ, the मिदिदिभ्य portion of the sūtra is useless because the words are mentioned in the गणपाठ along with the प्रत्यय : e in their साधित form. We think that the reference is to the मिदिदिगण which was to be found in the lost version of the Dhatupatha. Similar remarks apply to S III i 134.

In the Aśid itself there are two kinds of sūtras, which support this contention of ours that the author of the Aśid is not the author of the Dhatupatha. First, sūtras that are supplementary to the Dh P and secondly, sūtras that go against the Dh P and contradict what has been taught in the

the roots when stripped of their इत्'s would have been, गृह् etc. instead of गृह् etc. as required. But this is no great difficulty. It has been overcome in the Dhatupatha itself, by placing उ in the beginning of the root and इत् at its end; cf. उच्छदिर्, (Rudhadi) उवृदिर् (Rudhadi) उवृन्दिर्, (Bhvadi) Thus by reading उवृदिर् etc. for गृह् etc. in the Dh. P. the author of the Astā. were he the author of the Dhatupatha also, could have reduced this lengthy sutra to जृषिभ्यां च. That the author of the Astā, does not do so, shows that he got the Dh. P. well-fixed from his predecessors, and being unable to make any changes in the Dh. P. directly, had recourse to special Astā. sutras, whenever he wanted to modify the effect of the Dh. P. on roots. The point will become clearer, when we consider the second kind of supplementary sutras.

(1. b) These are sutras which in effect ascribe a class or gana to a root, in addition to the one to which it already belongs according to the Dh. P. S. III. 1. 70 is an example of this kind of sutra.

वा'भ्राश्र्ठाश्र्भमुनलमुत्तसितुदितपः ।

Kasika.- उभयत्र विभाषेयम् । दुष्प्राश्र् दुष्प्राश्र् भ्रमु अनवस्थाने भ्रमु चलने । द्वयोरपि ग्रहणम् । ऋमु पादविक्षेपे कलमु ग्लान्ती शक्ती उद्गने शुटी छेदने लप कान्ती एतेभ्यो वा श्यन् प्रत्ययो भवति ।

Nyasa.- उभयत्र विभाषेयमिति । अनेन नवस्थानार्थस्य ह्यभिप्रास्योऽथ दैवादिहरणान् प्राप्ते शुटेस्तौदादिकत्याद् आश्र्प्रश्र्तीना भौवादिकत्याद् अत्र प्राप्ते ।

The purpose of this sutra is in effect to assign the roots mentioned therein, to both the Bhvadi and the Divadi classes. According to this sutra, the roots भ्रमु, ऋमु and चलन्, which ex-

clusively take इयन् according to the Dh. P. being there mentioned only among the Divadis, take इयन् optionally; i. e. they take both इयन् and शप् (by S. III. i 68); i. e. they are in effect both Bhvadis and Divadis. Of the other roots mentioned in the sutra, जुद् occurs in the Dh. P. among the तुदादिस and the remaining among the Bhvadis. Thus the root जुद् would take only शप् as īkarana and the remaining roots only शप्, according to the Dh. P. But this sutra lays down that they optionally take इयन् also. Thus the sutra in effect says that जुद्, which according to the Dh. P. belongs only to the Tudadi class, ought also to belong to the Divadi class; & that the remaining roots, though only Bhvadis according to the Dh. P. ought to be considered as Divadis also. Now let us suppose that the author of the Astād was also the author of the Dh. P. What would we expect? We would expect him to have dispensed with this sutra, by including the roots mentioned in the sutra, in the Dh. P. in both the *ganas* to which they belong or ought to belong. Thus he could well have included the roots भ्राञ्, भ्लाञ्, ब्रम्, बलम्, लप्, and त्रम् in both the Bhvadis and the Divadis and the root जुद् in both the Divadis and the Tudadi. By so doing he could have altogether dispensed with this sutra (3.1.70.). There are many instances in which the same root is mentioned in more than one *ganas* or classes in the Dh. P. Thus प्लुङ् is included both in the Divadi and the Kryadi classes; पुष् अवबोधने in both the Divadi and the Bhvadi classes; पुषि प्राच्छादने among both the स्वादिस and the चुरादिस; अंगिमी भयचलनयो. in both the Tudadis and the Rv. dhadis, the root धूञ् कंसने occurs thrice in the Dh. P., in the स्वादिस, the Kryadis and the Churadīs. And the root षृञ् occurs

in the Dh P four times in four different classes among the Bhvadis, the Divadis, the Kryadis and the Churadis, Sayana remarks on this root thus - एक एव पुषिविकरणमदस्य पुन पठयते ।
Dhātuvṛtti, Vol II p 388

Now the fact that the author of the Aṣṭa does not dispense with the sūtra by including the roots mentioned therein in the various *ganās* in the Dh P to which they ought to belong can be explained only on the hypothesis that the author of the Aṣṭa was not the author of the Dh P that the author of the Aṣṭa got the Dh P from his predecessors as *upadeśa* and held it to be something sacred with the text of which he could in no way meddle.

Having thus far dealt with the Aṣṭa sūtras which are supplementary to the Dh P we now proceed to the second kind of sūtras referred to above viz sūtras that contradict what has been taught in the Dh P, sūtras that say that a certain root though mentioned in a certain class in the Dh P nevertheless does not at all belong to that class but to an altogether different class. S III 1-80 is an instance in point.

धिविकृणोर् च । III 1-80

Hasika — धिवि धिवि जिवि प्रीणनार्था । कृवि हिंसाकरणयो ।
इत्येतयोर्धात्वोन्प्रत्ययो भ्रम्यकारश्चान्तादेश । धिनोति कृणोति । अतो
लोपस्य स्थानिद् भाषाट्टणो न भवति ।

Nyasa — स्वादिवाच्छपि प्राप्ते वचनम् ।

In the Dh P root-धिवि and कृवि occur in the first or the Bhvadi class. And according to VII 1-58 (Iditonum

↑ Similar remarks apply to sūtras III 1-75, 76 & 82

dhatoh) the augment न् comes after the last vowel in the root. Thus we get धिन् and कृन्; and these roots, being according to the Dh P Bhvadis, would give us the forms धिन्ति, धिन्न, धिन्ति and कृन्ति, कृन्त, कृन्ति etc. But according to the opinion of the author of the Astadhyayi expressed in the sutra under consideration the roots are गि and कृ and take उ as *vikarana* instead of न्. Thus the author of the Astadhyayi is of opinion that the two roots are wrongly classed under the Bhvadis in the Dh P and that they really belong to the Tanadis class.

We think this is the strongest piece of internal evidence that could possibly be adduced to show that the author of the Astadhyayi is not the author of the Dh P. It also shows that a great deal of time must have intervened between the author of the Dh P and that of the Astadhyayi. At the time of the author of the Dh P the roots धिन् and कृन् were used among the Sistas, with न् for their *vikarana* but at the time of the author of the Astadhyayi, roots धिन् and कृन् belonging to the Bhvadi class were obsolete and the Sistas used them with the *vikarana* उ, इ, ए at the time of the author of the Astadhyayi the roots were current as Tanadis.

The foregoing is sufficient to convince us that the author of the Astadhyayi is not the author of the Dh P. But there is another circumstance also which forces upon us the conclusion that the author of the Astadhyayi got the Dh P from his predecessors, and held it to be something so sacred that he did not think it proper to make any changes in, or additions to it directly — we mean the occurrence in the Astadhyayi

of some roots which are quite unknown to the Dh P. There are called **सौत्रवाचक** roots occurring only in the Sutra and not in the Dh P. They are eight in number — कृति, occurring in III 1 29 उ in III 1 150 तु in VII 1 90 शानि in III 1 132 and कम्भु म्बुम्भु सम्भु and स्तुम्भु all in III 1 92 of these कम्भु occurs in III 1 52 also.

Now let us turn to the Bhasya on I 1 1. There we read as follows —

भाष्यम् — एतत्तु सिद्धे सति यदादिग्रहणं कर्तव्यं तत्राप्यन्याचार्य — अस्ति च पाठो बाह्यश्च सूत्रादिति । क्रमेतस्य ज्ञापनं प्रयोजनम् । पाठेन धातुसङ्केत्येतदुपपन्नं भवति ।

प्रतीप — पाठेनेति । ये धातुपाठे पठितास्तेषामेव धातुसङ्ख्या । तेषां पाठो नोपलक्षणार्थोऽपि तु इयत्ताप्रतिपादनार्थः ।

So Patanjali and Jayata tell us that all the dhatus in the Sanskrit language are to be found in the Dh P and that what is not to be found there is no *dhātu*. Then how can these *sautra* roots be called *dhatus* at all in view of the fact that they do not occur in the Dh P? Nagobhatta overcomes this difficulty by imagining that originally the roots did occur in the Dh P but that in course of time they have slipped out of it*. But this is very unlikely, nay rather impossible. If any thing the *patha* of these roots in the Dh P ought to have been the more firmly fixed because they occurred both in the Sutra and the Dh P. Many out of the way roots that do not occur either in

* पूर्व धातुपाठे पठितानामिदानीं पाठप्रचोदनीयत । V Bh N S
Edit Vol II. P 112 b

common literature or in the sūtras are *pathista* and not *paribhāṣta* in the Dh P. Then why should the *patha* of the sūtra roots be lost?

We think the non occurrence of the sūtra roots in the Dh P is to be attributed to the fact that the author of the Asta was not the author of the Dh P, and that though the author of the Asta, came across some roots not mentioned in the Dh P, yet he did not think it proper on his part to insert them into the Dh P, and thus tamper with its text, because the Dh P was something very sacred to him he having received it as *upadēśa* from his predecessors.

II

External Evidence

1 *Kaṣyapa*.—But how are we to get over the technical difficulty in calling words like ऋनि (occurring in S III : 29) वृद्धि (occurring in Vart अनेकानुवृद्धि वृद्धिग्रहणम्) and the वृद्धिः (occurring in the *band adā gāṇa* referred to in S वृद्धिः III : 27)—how to call these *dhatus* in as much as they do not occur in the Dh P? Kaṣyapa answers this question with the words — तत्र ये स्वयन्तिक भाष्य गणेषु पठ्यन्ते, तेऽपि सूत्रादिग्रन्थाभ्यां गन्तव्याध्यायनीयाः ।¹

सूत्रादिग्रन्थाभ्याम् evidently means स्वकार-वार्तिककार भाष्यकार-गणकाराणां ग्रन्थाभ्याम्. So Kaṣyapa says that the roots occurring in the Sūtra (Asta), the Vartika the Bhasya, and the Ganapāṭha, are also to be regarded as *dhatus* because the Sūtrakara, the Vartikakara, the Bhasyakara and the Ganakara are all of them authorities (*pramāṇyat*) in the matter of

dhātus or roots (just like the *Dhātupāthakara*). Evidently neither the *Bhāṣyakara* nor the *Vartikakara* is the author of the *Dh. P.* And the *Sutrikakara* who is spoken of in the same breath as the *Vartikakara* and the *Bhāṣyakara*, must also like the two latter be not the author of the *Dh. P.*, according to the rule of *साहचर्ये* or *copulae* *सहचर्या*. This shows that the *Sutrikakara* was according to *Kaṣṣaṭi*, different from the author of the *Dh. P.* Otherwise *Kaṣṣaṭi* would have spoken of the *sūtra* roots and the *Sutrikakara* separately from others, thus — तत्र यं वीक्षा धातवस्तपामपि धातुह्यम् । मन्मथस्य धातुसारादनन्यस्यान ।

An objection may be raised against this. *Kaṣṣaṭi* commenting on the *Bhāṣya* on the *Vart* परिमाणग्रहणं च in S I in 1 says — ततश्च भेषजदाण्डादिप्रसङ्गः । न चार्थपाठः परिच्छेदक । तस्य अपाणिनीयत्वात् । The expression तस्य अपाणिनीयत्वात् indicates that *Kaṣṣaṭi* held the अर्थनिर्देश to be अपाणिनीय and the *Dh. P.* minus the अर्थनिर्देश to be *Pāṇinīya*. But the word 'Pāṇinīya' is ambiguous, meaning both पाणिनिना प्रोक्तम् and पाणिनिना अभ्युपगमम् । And we are told by no less an authority than the author of the *Nyāsa*, that the word 'Pāṇinīya', when used with reference to the *Dh. P.*, is to be understood in the latter sense.

2 CHANDRA—

In his *Vṛtti* on S I : 43 of his work Chandra refers to the statement at the end of the *Pāṇinian Dh. P.* viz पुच्छद्विषु धातुर्ध्वजमिहम्, as the saying of the *Dhātukara*

ऽअपाणिनीयमिति । पाणिनेरिदं पाणिनीयम् । न पाणिनीयमपाणिनीयमिति ।

नेन अनभ्युपगमात् । न तु तेन अकृतत्वात् । *Nyāsa* on VII is 3

नय। चाह वातुमाराऽपि . p 14 Candravritti And comment ng on
II : 93 हे स्यः शोभना सूत्रस्य कृति पाणिनः p 114 and

3 PATANJALI

The following references to Panini by name occur in the Bhasya —

दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिने । VII. 1 37. पाणिने सूत्रागस्य ।
II ii 16 नहि पाणिनिना शब्दा प्राक्ता । किं तर्हि ? सूत्र ।
Paspasa कथं पुनरिदं भगवन् पाणिनेर्गार्हस्थ्यं यक्षणे प्रवृत्तम् ।
Ibid शोभना खलु सूत्रस्य कृति पाणिनिना । II ii 66 सर्वे
सर्वपदादेशा दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिने । VII. 1 37 प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानाच्च
भगवन् पाणिनें सिद्धम् । VII. 1 2 आनुगाय यज्ञ पाणिने ।
I ii 83 उपसेदिमान् कास्त पाणिनिन् । III ii 108

We see that Patanjali speaks of Panini several times in his Bhasya. He tells us that Panini was the son Dakṣi that he taught the Sutra and so he was the Sutrakara that his way of composing the Sutra was admirable that he held the सर्वपदादेश theory that he held the *anuyutpatti* theory of nouns that his fame had spread even unto children and that a descendent of Kutsa came to him as pupil.

Now it is very significant that Panini is nowhere in the Bhasya mentioned as the author of the Dh. P. whereas he has been mentioned several times as the author of the Sutra.

The word Paniniya also occurs in the Bhasya. It means a student of what has been taught by Panini or simply what has been taught by Panini. And what has been taught by Panini ? The Sutra

इति पाणिनिना शब्दा प्राक्ता । किं तर्हि ? सूत्रम् । Paspasa

Pāṇini is known as the author of the *Vyākaraṇa* that goes by his name * Now Kaṭyāvaṇi defines *Vyākaraṇa* as लक्ष्यलक्षणे † What is the *laksya* ? The 'śabda or words as used in the *Loka* and the *Veda*. And what is *laksana*? It is the *Sutra* ‡ Let us now see whether the Dh. P. can be included in either category. It cannot evidently be included in *laksana* which is *sutra* § And moreover *laksana* is described as सामान्यविशेषवत् ¶ and this description obviously does not apply to the Dh. P. Neither can it be included in the *laksya* because roots are used neither in the *Loka* nor in the *Veda* by themselves. It may be said that the *laksya* is *śabda* or words and the Dh. P. consists of roots which are *śabda* or words and that therefore we can say that the Dh. P. being a list of words is included in the *Laksya*. But it is to be noted that the words *śabda* and *laksya* are used both in the *Bhāṣya* and the *Vartika* in the sense of words used in the *Loka* and the *Veda* and neither in the *Loka* nor in the *Veda* are bare roots without *pratyayas* used. Therefore the words *śabda* and *laksya* in the *Bhāṣya*

* येनाक्षरमामान्यमविगम्य महश्वरात् ।

‡ एतन् व्याकरणं पाठो नाम पाणिनीयम् ॥ १॥ अ. ५७.

† Vartika — लक्ष्यलक्षणे व्याकरणम् । Paspasa

‡ किं पुनर्लक्ष्यम् ? किं वा लक्षणम् ? शब्दो लक्ष्यः । सूत्रं लक्षणम् ।

Paspasa

§ Cf. अस्ति न पाठा वाच्यः सूत्रात् । (पाठः = शतुपाठः) Bl १७१a on I 111 1

¶ कथं तद्व्याम शब्दो प्रतिपत्तव्याः । किञ्चित् सामान्यविशेषवत्क्षणे प्रययम् यनान्येन यत्नेन महता महतः शब्दोपात्तं प्रतिपद्येरन् । किं पुनस्तत् । चत्सर्गादयादी । कश्चिदुत्पत्तिः कर्तव्यः कश्चिदुपपादः । Paspasa.

and the Vartika do not include the roots mentioned in the Dh P. Even if it be held that the words *lakṣya* and *śabda* include the roots mentioned in the Dh P yet we cannot say that Pāṇini is the author of the Dh P. Patañjali emphatically says न हि पाणिनिना शब्दा प्रोक्ता । किं न हि सूत्रम् । And to judge from his Vartika on VI iii 7 and 8, Katvayan is of opinion that the word *Vyākaraṇa* does not include the Dh P §

In one passage Patañjali refers to the author of the Dh P as the Acharya of both himself and the Sutrakara

स्वरितनित कर्त्रभिप्राय क्रियाफल । । iii 72.

भाष्यम् — स्वरितनित इति किमर्थम् ? याति वाति द्राति प्साति । स्वरितनित इति शक्यमकतुम् । इह कश्मान् भवति, याति वाति द्राति प्साति इति । कर्त्रभिप्राय क्रियाफल इत्युच्यते सर्वे वा च कर्त्रभिप्राय क्रियाफलमस्ति । त एव विहास्याम । यथा कर्त्रभिप्रायमकर्त्रभिप्राय च क्रियाफलमस्ति तभ्य आत्मनपद भवतीति । न च यथा कर्त्रभिप्राय चाकर्त्रभिप्राय च क्रियाफलमस्ति । तथाजातीयका खलु आचार्येण स्वरितनित पठिता य उभयवन् । यथा कर्त्रभिप्राय चाकर्त्रभिप्राय च क्रियाफलमस्ति ।

Here Patañjali maintains that the Sutrakara could have omitted the word स्वरितनित from the sutra, and cites in *Acharya*, in his argument against the use of the word. It is evident that the word *Acharya* must refer to

Cf धातुर्वेदः । Bhasya on III ii 115

§ व्याकरणाद्याया चतुर्थ्या । VI iii 7

परस्य च । VII iii 8

यातिकम् — आत्मनभाषपरस्मैभाषयोरुपसर्गानाम् ।

प्रश्न — आत्मनभाषपरस्मैभाषयोरुपसर्गानां च न केचिन्निदं व्याकरणेन सञ्ज्ञेन विनियुक्तमिति अस्माकमप्ययम् ।

a person who stands in the relation of an *Acharya* to both the *Sūtrahara* and *Patanjali* and in this case he can be none else than the *Dhātulāra*.

The point will become clearer when we consider some of the cases in which the *Vartikakāra* is attacked and shown that his *Vartikā* is either not needed or wrong on the ground of *Acharya pravṛtti*.

Under SS I : 65 & 66 *Ātayan* attacks the *प्रक-परपक्ष* with the *Vartikā*—

वा॥ सप्तमीपञ्चम्याश्च भावादुभयत्र पष्ठे प्रकृतिस्त्रांभयकार्यप्रसंग । व ।।

Ātayan in his turn, attacks *Ātayan* and his *Vartikā* thus—

भा॥ यद्युच्यते—सप्तमापञ्चम्याश्च भावादुभयत्र पष्ठे प्रकृतिस्त्रांभयकार्यप्रसङ्ग इति । नपदोप । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति नामे युगप-
प्रकृतिप्रसङ्ग इति । यदयमेव प्रत्ययसंगति प्रत्ययग्रहण करोति ।

Here the *Acharya* referred to is neither the *Vartikāra* nor the *Dhātulāra* but a third person viz *Patanjali*, who is the *Acharya* of both *Ātayan* and *Ātayan*.

Acharya referred to here is neither Patanjali who attacks nor Katyayana, who is attacked but a third person viz. Pāṇini who is Acharya to both Katyāyana and Patanjali.

कल्पापिष्ठाद्यायनान्तेरामिम्यथ । IV ॥ 104

यानिङ्गम् प्रत्यश्कारिग्रहणम् ।

भाष्यम् - प्रत्यश्कारिग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । अन्तराम्यन्तेरामिम्यथा मा भूदिति । तत्तद्धि उक्तं यम् । न उक्तं यम् । कल्पापिष्ठाद्यायनप्रमाणं जापकं रगम्पायनान्तेरासिषु प्रत्यश्कारिग्रहणम् । यदयं कल्पापिष्ठाद्यायनग्रहणं कर्तव्यं तत्रापाययाचाया नान्तेराम्यन्तेरामिम्यथा भवतीति । etc

Here Katyāyana's Vartika is attacked on the ground that what he means to say by means of the Vartika is already indicated by implication by the Acharya by his insertion of the word *Kṛhadyanā* in the *Shantukādi* class or group, in the word *Kalpā* in the sūtra (IV ॥ 104). It is quite evident that the word *Acharya* here refers to neither Katyāyana who is attacked nor to Patanjali who attacks but refers to a third person viz. the Sūtrakāri who is Acharya to both Pāṇini and Katyāyana.

Now let us turn to the 'स्वरितनित' passage again.

स्वरितनितं कर्मिप्राये क्रियाफले । I ॥ 72

भाष्यम् - स्वरितनित इति निमर्थम् ^१ याति शति द्रति प्वाति । स्वरितत्रिण इति शक्यमकर्तुम् । इह कम्मान्न भवति, याति शति द्रति प्वातीति^२ कर्मिप्राये क्रियाफल इत्युच्यते । मर्षा च कर्मिप्राय क्रियाफलमस्ति । न एव विज्ञाम्यामौ येषां कर्मिप्राय चाकर्मिप्राय च क्रियाफलमस्ति तेभ्यः सामनेपदं भवतीति । न चर्षा कर्मिप्राय चाकर्मिप्राय च क्रियाफलमस्ति । तथाज्ञातीयका खलु आचार्येण स्वरितनितं पठिता, ये उभयवन्त येषां कर्मिप्राय चाकर्मिप्राय च क्रियाफलमस्ति ।

Here Patanjali attacks the Sutrakara and says he could have done as well without using the word 'स्वरितप्रित', and cites an Acharya in his argument against the use of the word. It is evident, that, as in the passages quoted above, the word Acharya must refer neither to the person attacked viz. the Sutrakara, nor to the person attacking viz. the Bhasyakara, but must refer to a third person viz. the 'शातुपादभार' who is the Acharya of both Patanjali and Panini, and who is responsible for the 'स्वरितप्रित' reading of roots 'यथा कर्त्तृभिर्ग्राह्यं वाक्यंभिर्ग्राह्यं च क्रियाफलमस्ति ।

4 JIVENDRA BUDDHI.—

If there still linger any doubts in the mind of the reader as to the non identity of Panini, the author of the Astadhyayi and the author of the Dh. P., the author of the Nyasa sets them at rest finally. Commenting on VII. iv. 3 he says—
 “ प्रतिपादितं हि पूर्वं गणकार पाणिनिर्न भवतीति । तथा आन्यां हि गणकार अन्यथ सूत्रकार । ” And again on VII. iv. 75. he says—
 “ यत्रच त्रिप्रथमं त्रिथने निष्कारनामन्ने वृत्तरे विमर्षम् ? एतद् गणकारः प्रथम्य. न सूत्रकारः । अन्यां हि गणकारोऽन्यथ सूत्रकार इत्युक्तं प्राक् ।

I have not been able to find out where it is definitely established (प्रतिपादितं) by the author of the Nyasa that the Sutrakara and the Dhātukara are different. But it should be noted that his comment on I. iii. 1. and 2 clearly suggests that Panini accepted the Dh. P. from his predecessors. * In his comment on VII. iv. 3. he says that the Dh. P. is called

* गणपादनामध्यानि शातुपादभार्याजियते । Nyasa I. iii. 1.

Paniniya, not because Panini composed it, but because he accepted it §

I must here acknowledge that I was first made aware of the passage under VII iv 3 in the *Nyasa* — after I had independently arrived at the conclusion that the author of the *Aṣṭa* was not the author of the *Dh P* by the remarks

As to the inclusion of *Nyasa* in the *Chatriya* (VI iii 4) *Gāndhī* (IV ii 65) and the *Kāndhī* (IV i 80) *ganas* it is to be noted that the groups of words originally fixed had been augmented with later additions to them by other grammarians. This probably led Jinendra Buddha to observe in VII ii 3 'प्रतिपादितं हि पूर्वं गणकार पाणिनिन भवतीति । तथा च न्या हि गणकारोऽन्या हि मूलकारः' — made by Shrish Chandra Chakravarti in his Introduction (p 1) to his scholarly edition of the *Nyasa*. But it is subtle! the author of the *Nyasa* does not mean by the word '*ganakara*' the author of the *Pratipadika* *ganas*, but the author of the *Dh P*. This is quite clear from the context where the passage in question occurs in the *Nyasa*. Cf also *Nyasa* on I iii 1 भूवादया दशगणीपरिपठिता गृह्यन्ते । and 'गणपाठस्तु पूर्ववदेवासीन्नियते ।' Ibid

§ अपाणिनीयमिति । पाणिनिरिदं पाणिनीयम् न पाणिनीयम्-अपाणिनीयमिति । तेनानभ्युपगमात् न तु तेनाकृतत्वात् । VII ii 3

But there are great and at first sight almost insuperable difficulties in the way of our accepting the theory that the author of the Aśd. is no other than the author of the Dh. P. also. The Dh. P. presupposes many of the sūtras of the Aśd. Let us for example take the Sūtra, *पञ्च च सप्तानाम्* (VI 1 15) and the Sūtra *यन्निस्त्रयिष्यद्दीर्घा द्वित्वे* (VI 1 17). If the author of the Dh. P. had not in his mind these or similar sūtras while composing his Dh. P. he would not have collected all the seven roots whose अवगम्य स्थान वा लकार आदेशा भवन्ति अभ्यासलापश्चण्डि कृन्नि परन् यन्नि रमेदि, in one place with the root *पञ्* at their head similarly he would not have collected all the roots which rule *Samprasāraṇa* किति प्रत्यय परन् in one place with the root *यञ्* at their head. If the author of the Dh. P. were absolutely ignorant of any rule like इम्यन्त क्षणश्चमनाटुणिश्चेदिता (VII 1 5) he could not have attached *ण* as इत् or indicative letter in his Dh. P. to such of the roots as rule no *vriddhi* इडादी निचि परस्मैपठ परन्. And if he were quite innocent of any rule like दक्षितोऽश्रुत् (III 1 19) there would not have been found in the Dh. P. roots like दुयम्. Such examples can be adduced by scores. And this would seem to irresistibly force upon us the conclusion that the author of the Aśd. is also the author of—in Goldstucker's words—at least the ground work of the existing Dh. P.*

We have now arrived at a dilemma —

* We may note here one difficulty in accepting Goldstucker's view that the ground work of the Dh. P. is Panini's and that it was enlarged by Acharvas that came after Panini. If the Dh. P. was enlarged after the time of Panini then why were the *sāmānta* roots not included in it?

The Dh. P. does not seem to be by the author of the Aśtd, but seems to be the work of a predecessor of Pāṇini. But nevertheless the arrangement of roots in the Dh. P. clearly shows that the author of the Dh. P. knew very many sutras now found in the Aśtd and so arranged the roots in the Dh. P. as to serve the purposes of those sutras.

CHAPTER III

THE PARIBHĀSAS

परितः प्रमिताक्षरापि सर्वं विषयं व्यास्यन्ती गता प्रतिष्ठाम् ।

न खलु प्रणिह्न्यते कदाचित् परिभाषेयं गरीयसी यदात्रा ॥

शिशुपालवध. XVI 80

If any one were to pick up a copy of the Aṣṭa and try to learn the Sanskrit language from it, he will be sorely disappointed. He will find that the arrangement of topics and rules (sūtras) in the Aṣṭa is not the arrangement that is followed in modern works on Sanskrit grammar. We must remember that the Aṣṭa was written, not for those whose mother-tongue was not Sanskrit and who had to learn Sanskrit quite anew, but for those whose mother tongue was Sanskrit, who used Sanskrit in their daily life, and who required a *short, but exhaustive* hand book of Sanskrit grammar from which they could ascertain the correct form of a word whenever there arose any doubts in their minds as to its correctness. Therefore the two things that were aimed at in the Aṣṭa were *brevity* and *exhaustiveness*. And to secure these ends there is followed in the Aṣṭa a peculiar arrangement of topics and sūtras, which appears at first sight so puzzling and unmethodical to a modern student of Pāṇini. But it would be a great mistake to suppose that there is no method in the Aṣṭa. The method followed in the Aṣṭa is given in what are called the Paribhāṣas. They teach how the sūtras of the Aṣṭa are to be interpreted and applied; they explain

among other things, the significance of the various इत्स or indicatory letters, and of the use of different cases in the Asti. They are, so to say, the key with which to unlock the intricacies of the Asti.

The Paribhasas applicable to the Asti, are of two kinds —

1 Those that are expressly laid down in the Asti itself

2 Those that are applicable to the Asti though not expressly laid down therein because they are, in the words of the Paribhasendusekara, — पणिनीयनन्वे शापकन्यायमिद्वानि ।

In the following few pages we shall consider only some of the important Paribhasas of the first kind. We shall begin with the simplest of them, viz —

I

विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम् । I 1. 2.

Kasika — तुल्यबलविरोधो विप्रतिषेधः । यत् द्वौ प्रमाणान्याधा-
नेकस्मिन् युगपद्भासते स तुल्यबलविरोधो विप्रतिषेधः । तस्मिन् विप्रतिषेधे
यत् कार्यं भवति । उतमापत्रादनित्यामित्यान्तरवर्हिष्ठेषु तुल्यबलता ना-
स्तीति नापम्य संगस्य विषयः । कर्तव्यं तत्र भवितव्यम् । अप्रवृत्तौ
पथायेण वा प्रवृत्तौ प्राप्ताया वचनमागम्यते । अतो दीर्घा यत्नि मुपिचेत्य-
स्यावकाशः । वृक्षाभ्याम् । वृक्षाभ्याम् । बहुवचने शपेदित्यस्यावकाशः ।
वृक्षेभ्यु । वृक्षेभ्यु । इहोमय प्राप्नोति । वृक्षेभ्य वृक्षेभ्य इति । परं भवति
विप्रतिषेधेन ॥

The word *vipratishedha* means 'opposition of rules of equal force'. When two sutras having different objects in view find scope of action simultaneously in one particular case, that opposition of sutras of equal force is called *vipratishedha*.

A general rule and its exception, or an invariable and an optional rule or an *antaranga* and a *baharanga* rule, are not rules of equal force. There the stronger prevails against the weaker. As an example of rules of equal force, see VII in 102 and 103. The first rule declares—"When a case affix beginning with a letter of the य् *pratyahara* follows, the long vowel \bar{a} is substituted for the final of an inflective base ending in an अ १ वृत्त + भ्याम् = वक्ष्म + भ्याम्. The next rule declares—"When a plural case affix beginning with a letter of the म् *pratyahara* follows, ए is substituted for the final short अ of an inflective base." As वृक्ष + सु = वृक्षेसु. But when the plural case affix 'भ्य' follows, what rule are we to apply? For the letter म् belongs to both the *Pratyaharas* यन् and म्. Are we to lengthen the short अ or substitute ए? Here there is अनियम. The present sūtra comes in, and substitutes नियम in the place of अनियम, by laying down that ए is to be substituted because VII in 103 ordaining ए comes after VII in 102. Thus वृक्ष + भ्यम् वृक्षेभ्य. So we arrive at the definition of Paribhāṣa—अनियमे नियमकारिणी परिभाषा।

There is a sūtra corresponding to this 1st sūtra in the Purva Mimamsa Sūtra of Jaimini—

पौर्वाण्य पूर्वदौर्बल्य प्रकृतिवत् । VI v 51

The grounds on which this sūtra rests and which apply equally to the corresponding *Vakaranasūtra* under consideration are very clearly stated by Mithras in his Jaiminiyaṇṇī Samudāyasthā, thus—

उत्पद्यमानं चांतरज्ञानं स्वविरुद्धस्य पूर्वज्ञानस्य बाधेन योत्पद्यते । ननु निरपेक्षत्वस्य समानत्वात् पूर्वज्ञानमेवोत्तमस्य बाधकमस्ति चेत् । न । पूर्वज्ञान-

नोपत्तिदशायामनियमानयोत्तमज्ञानस्य वायत्रायोगात् ॥ उत्तरकाले तु
स्य वाचिनि पूर्वाज्ञान कथमुत्तमस्य वाचक भवेत् ।

In his *Bhāṣya* on I : 48 Patanjali says that the अधिकार
is of three kinds and proceeds to enumerate and explain them
Of these the first is described as follows —

भाष्यम् — कश्चिदेवदेशस्य सर्वं शास्त्रमपि उच्यते । यदा प्रदीप
मुपगच्छति सर्वं देशमपि उच्यते ।

प्रदीप — कश्चिदिति । परिभाषास्य इत्यर्थः ।

Thus a *Paribhāṣa* is, according to Patanjali, of universal
application in the Aśtd. This is but what we would expect.
The *Paribhāṣa* being a rule of interpretation, ought to apply
to the whole of the book to which it was meant to apply, if
the book is the work of one author written according to a
definite plan. If we find that a *Paribhāṣa* is not of universal
application, then, we may be sure, there is a grave irregularity
which calls for a thorough investigation.

Now, is this *Paribhāṣa* laid down in I iv 2 of universal
application in the Aśtd? Can we say of this *Paribhāṣa* that
she एवदेशस्य सर्वं शास्त्रमपि उच्यते? Turning to the *Bhāṣya*
on the sūtra under consideration, we find that Kātyāyana
had noticed that this *Paribhāṣa* did not apply to the *Angadhī-*
kāra and so proposed to restate the sūtra thus —

विप्रतिपक्षे परमगाधिसार पूर्वम् ।

But even this amendment would not mend matters, be-
cause there were found to be cases of परविप्रतिपक्ष in the अंगाधि-
कार and of पूर्वविप्रतिपक्ष in the other parts of the Aśtd. So
Patanjali offers us the counsel of despair that the word पर
in the sūtra be taken to mean इव

भाष्यम् — यथान्यासमेवास्तु । कथं ये पूर्वविप्रतिषेधा । विप्रतिषेधे परमियेय सिद्धम् । कथम् । परशब्दोऽयं वर्धय । अस्त्येय व्यग्रस्थायां वर्तते, तत्र सा—पूर्वं पर इति । अस्त्यन्यार्थे वर्तते—परपुत्र परभायां । अन्यपुत्रोऽन्यभायति गम्यते । अस्ति प्राधान्ये वर्तते तदथा — परमियं प्राण्यग्निं कुटुम्बे । प्रधानमग्निं गम्यते । अग्नीष्टयानां परशब्दस्तद्यथा पर धाम गत । इष्ट धाम गत इति गम्यते । तद्य इष्टवाचां परशब्दस्तस्येदं ग्रहणम् । विप्रतिषेधे पर यदिष्ट तद्वर्तीति ।

प्रदीप - तद्य इष्टवाचीति । इष्टानिष्टविभागश्च व्याख्यानाद् बोध्य ।

उद्योत ननु लक्षणचक्षुषा तद्विभागो दुर्ज्ञेयोऽन आह इष्टानिष्टेति ।

The remarks of Kaiyata and Nagoji show where the real weakness of Patanjali's explanation lies. If we accept Patanjali's rendering of the word पर by the word इष्ट, then the Paribhasa becomes worse than useless as it serves no purpose as we have to fall back upon the *Vṛkhyāna* to know what is इष्ट. Another thing to note in this connection is that Patanjali himself was not satisfied with this explanation of the Sutra and so proposed to overcome the difficulty of पूर्वविप्रतिषेध under S I in 11 by taking the word अधिस्तर in that sutra to mean अधिस्तर कार. Says he

अधिक कार — पूर्वविप्रतिषेधाश्च न पठितव्या भवति । गुणवृद्धयो त्वत्त्वद्भावेभ्यो नु पूर्वविप्रतिषेद्धम् । नुमचिस्त्वत्त्वद्भावेभ्यो नुद् इति । नुमुटो स्वरिष्येते । तत्र स्वरितेनाधिक कारो भवतीति नुमुटो भविष्यत ।

The Vartika and the portion of the Bhasya which we have up to now considered show that the rule laid down in I in 2 applies broadly speaking to the whole of the Asta

except the *Angadhikara* in the *Angadhikara* the rule is विप्रतिपक्ष पूर्वम्, that is exactly the reverse of what it is in the rest of the *Astad*. Thus the *Angadhikara* does not agree with regard to its arrangement of the weaker and stronger rules with the rest of the *Astad*. In the *Astad* except the *Angadhikara* the stronger rule generally speaking follows after the weaker one and prevails over it but in the *Angadhikara* on the other hand it is the stronger rule that comes first and then follows the weaker. What is the explanation of this anomaly?

II

आद्यन्ती टवित्ती । 1 : 45

Kasika - आदिष्टिद्भन्यत्र निद्भनति पट्टीनिर्दिष्टस्य । लृता ।
मुण्ठो मीपयते । टिप्रदेशा — आर्धधातुकस्येड्गणदेशित्येयमादय ।
निप्रदेशा मियो हेतुभये पुक् इत्येयमादय ।

Of whatsoever the augments enunciated are distinguished by an indicatory द् or क they precede or follow it accordingly

This sūtra explains the special use of two of the indicatory letters ११३ द् and क. Where the indicatory letter of an augment is द् that augment is to be placed before the word in the genitive case with regard to which it is enjoined while a कित् augment is to be added after the word exhibited in the genitive case with regard to which it is enjoined and becomes the end part or अन्त of the word to which it is added. Thus there is a sūtra (VII n 35) which says — Ardhadhātuka affixes beginning with a consonant except य have क्. The question arises 'Where

is this इत् to be added, in the beginning or the end or the middle of the अर्धधातुक affix ? This sutra answers the question. The indicatory ट shows, that it is to be placed before the अर्धधातुक affix. Thus "इत्" in the future termination स्यति is an अर्धधातुक affix, when this is added to the root, it takes the augment इत्, इ, being placed before इत्, thus भु + इत्स्यति = भविष्यति. Similarly हसिष्यति

Similarly by sūtra VII m. 40 : the root भू takes the augment पुक् in forming the causative. This having an indicatory क् is to be added after the root भू and when added becomes the end part of the root, as सी पुक् सिच् त= सीपयते

Thus far everything is quite clear. But we come across sutras like चरेष्ट and आतोऽनुपमर्गे क् . In ट the real affix is अ, the letter इ being indicatory. Now an affix is "an addition placed at the beginning or end of a root, stem or word, to modify its meaning" (C O E D). Where is the addition अ to be placed, at the beginning of root चर् or at its end ? The indicatory letter इ would seem to point to the beginning of the root चर्, as the proper place. But the sutra परध, (III: 2) asks us to place the affix अ after the root चर्. How to come out of this difficulty ? The question has been dealt with by Katjāyana and Patañjali at length, and we shall turn to them

वार्तिकम् - टक्तितोराद्यन्तनिधाने प्रत्ययप्रतिषेधः ।

भाष्यम् - टक्तितोराद्यन्तनिधाने प्रत्ययस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । प्रत्यय आदिरन्तो वा मा भूदिति । चरेष्ट आतोऽनुपमर्गे क इति ।

When we lay down a rule that a प्रत् and १ मि become respectively the beginning and end of a stem we have to exclude a *pratyaya* from the operation of the rule so that a *pratyaya*, shall not be taken to be either a beginning or an end of the stem it is added to, for example in चष्ट and अनाशुपयने क

गार्निम् - परचनान् मिदम् ।

भाष्यम् - परचनान्प्रत्यय आदिगन्तो ना न भविष्यति ।

A *pratyaya* will be neither a beginning nor an end of the stem because S परध (III : 2) lays down that a *pratyaya* shall be placed *after* the stem

गार्निम् - परचनान्मिदमिति अभाषादत्वात् ।

भाष्यम् - परचनान्मिदमिति चेतन्न । किं कारणम् 'अपवाद-
नात् । अपवादाऽयं याग । तद्यथा मिदचान्यात् पर इत्येव योग म्याने ,
यागत्वस्य प्रत्ययपरत्वस्य चापवादः ।

It cannot be said that the difficulty is solved by S III : 2 Why ? Because this rule is an exception (to S पर४) just as 'मिदनायां पर' is an exception to the rules 'परी स्थान यागा ' and 'परध'

भाष्यम् - त्रिषम उपन्यास । युक्तं तत्र यदनन्तकान् निष्करण म्यानायागान् प्रत्ययपन्त्र च वा स्ते । इह पुनश्च मायकायाम् । द्विवर्ण न्यायादाश --- इति ज्ञाताया यया म्यात् । निष्करणम्यादायां निना यकाग्नोपो यथा न्यात् ।

Your statement is wide of the mark It is but proper in the case of III : १० (इरादिभ्यः), that the indicatory

letter म्, having no other purpose than to indicate that the *pratyāṅga* न् is to be placed after the last vowel, according to sūtra सिद्धवाऽन्यात्परः, should make that sūtra an exception to S ५ परो म्थ नयागा and परथः. But in the case of sūtras चण्ड and आनानुषंगक, both the indicator letters द् and क् have other scope than the indication of the place where the *pratyāṅgas* are to be added to the roots. The indicator letter द् in the *pratyāṅga* ट् shows that the feminine of the word which is to form by the addition of ट् is to be formed with the affix णीप् (IV : 15) as उरचरी, मद्रचरी and the indicator letter क् in the addition क् shows that the औ at the end of a stem is to be elided when adding the affix क् (VI : 64). Therefore the indicator letters द् and क् in SS चण्ड and आनानुषंगक having other scope, cannot be deemed to be there for the purpose of showing the place where the affixes are to be added to the stem and so they cannot make S 1 : 40 an exception to S परथः.

भाष्यम् - प्रयोजन नाम तदुक्तं यन्नियोगस्त स्यात् । यदि चायं नियोगस्त पर स्यात् तत एतत्प्रयोजन स्यात् । कुना तु एतेन—
टिकर्णादयं परो भविष्यति न पुनरादिरिति । स्त्रिकर्णाद्यं परो भविष्यति न पुनस्त इति ।

प्रदीपः प्रयोजनमिति । सति पक्षे प्रयोजनमेतस्यान् । पक्षेनेत्यव्यभिचार्यम् ।

भाष्यम्— टितश्चाप्यपरिहारः । स्यादेव ह्ययं टित्करणदादिर्न पुनरन्त ।

Your explanation does not remove the difficulty about the टित् affixes also. On account of the indicatory ट् the *pratyaya* would necessarily become the आदि of the stem, and not पर.

भाष्यम्— क तर्हीदानीमिदं स्यात्—टित ईकारो भवतीति ।

Then where does the rule, that a word ending in a टित् affix takes the affix ई to form the feminine apply ?

भाष्यम्— य उभययान्—गापोष्टनिति । *

To the case of an affix which has both the indicatory letters ट् and क्; to “गापोष्टक्” for example.

वार्तिकम्— सिद्धं तु पष्ठयधिकारे वचनात् ।

भाष्यम्— सिद्धमेतत् । कथम् । पष्ठयधिकारेऽयं योगः कर्तव्यः । आद्यन्तौ पष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्येति ।

The Pratyayas can be saved from the operation of this rule (*paribhasa*) How ? This rule should be put under the domain of the पष्ठी, thus — “Affixes having a ट् or a क् as an indicatory letter, become respectively the beginning and end of that which is put in the पष्ठी or the genitive case”

वार्तिकम्— आद्यन्तयोर्वा पष्ठयर्थत्वात्तदभावेऽसम्प्रत्ययः ।

भाष्यम्— आद्यन्तयोर्वा पष्ठयर्थत्वात् तदभावे पष्ठया अभावे असम्प्रत्ययः स्यात्—आदिरन्तो वा न भविष्यति ।

* प्रदीप— अत्र कित्वात्परत्वादन्तत्वमिति टित्त्वमेतद्वयतीति दोषोऽयमवकाशः । ततश्च चरेष्ट इत्ययमादिः स्यात् ।

Or, because to express the sense of 'आदि' or 'अन्त' the *स* or the genitive case is necessary, therefore when there is no *पठो* used, neither 'आदि' nor 'अन्त' can be understood

भाष्यम् - युक्त पुनर्यच्छब्दनिमित्तको नामार्थे स्यात् ? नार्थनिमित्तेन नाम शब्देन भवितव्यम् ?

Is it right that the meaning should be subservient to words ? Rather, is it not that words should be subservient to sense ?

भाष्यम् - अर्थनिमित्तक एव शब्द । त्वयम् ? आद्यन्तौ पठ्यर्थौ । न चात्र पठ्यौ पश्याम । ते मन्यामहे—आद्यन्तावेवात्र न स्त । तयारभावे पठ्यपि न भवतीति ।

Yes certainly it is the sense that should cause the use of words. How then ? Whenever we have to express the sense of 'adi' or 'anta' we must necessarily use a *पठो*. This is the beginning of this, this is the end of that. We do not see any *sasthi* here (*स* in SS like चरष्ट and आतो-शुपमर्गौ क). Therefore we think here there is neither an *adi* nor an *anta* meant.

The portion of the Bhasya we have considered up to now establishes that —

1 The sūtra आद्यन्तौ ट्ठितौ is an exception to the sūtra परश्च (परश्चनार्तिगदमिति त्रैत्रापवादत्वात्)

And

2 The difficulty indicated in वा ॥ ट्ठितोरप्यन्तविधानं प्रत्ययप्रतिपद १, can be met in two ways as indicated in the two वाक्याः —

a तिद्धं तु षष्ठ्यधिकारे वचनात् ।

b आद्यतयावां षष्ठ्यर्थत्वात्तद्भावेऽसम्प्रत्यय ।

So in S चरेष्ट, 'चरे' is in the ablative case and consequently ट cannot be taken to be there for the purpose of indicating that the अ is to be added at the beginning of root चर् itself such would have been taken to be the purpose of the indicatory ट if 'चर' were a *sasthi*, when the rule आद्यन्ती टङितौ would have applied. Similar is the case with S आतांनुपसर्गे क. It is only the absence of a *sasthi*, (आत being abl. sing.) which saves the *pratyaya* अ from being the end part of the root to which it is added.

Now let us see if there are any sutras, where an affix with an indicatory ~ or क is enjoined (विहित), and where the *prakriti* or the stem is indubitably put in the genitive case. Many such cases occur, of them गापाष्टक् and ब्रीहिशाम्योर्दृक् are two. Here indubitably the words गापा and ब्रीहिशाम्य। expressing the *prakritis* or stems, are put in the genitive case. And according to the conclusion arrived at in the Bhasya, we shall have to say, that the use of the genitive makes the *pratyaya* the end part or *anta* of the *prakritis* or stems to which it is added. We can say — आद्यन्ती षष्ठ्यर्थो । षष्ठी चात्र पर्याम । मन्व्यामह आद्यन्तावत्र स । तयामावे षष्ठ्यपि भवतीति । How to avoid this difficulty? Kaṇyaka says on this point — गापाष्टक्, ब्रीहिशाम्योर्दृक् इत्यादावपि आनन्तर्यमन्वये षष्ठी । न त्ववयवावयवगम्ये । प्रत्ययपरत्वेन प्रतिशङ्ग समिहितेनाङ्गविच्छेदादनापित्तादस्य अनुपस्थानात् । Here Kaṇyaka says that the sutra परस्य satisfies our आकांक्षा with regard to the place of the affixes टङ् and

ट् and so, there being no आभासा about the place of the terminations the sutra आद्यन्ती टङ्गिती does not apply. But here Kaiyata contradicts the Bhasya in as much as it has been established in the Bhasya, that S अद्यन्ती टङ्गिती, like S सिद्ध चान्दियान पर, is an exception to the rule परश्च. Another explanation is given by the Nyasa — नच गापाटमियादी प्रकृतयाऽव्ययपठ्या निर्दिष्टा । किं ताहि । मुपा मुपा भवन्तीति पयम्यर्थे वा पठ्यी तथेति । This explanation does not, as Kaiyata does, go against what has been said in the Bhasya. A reference to III = 6, 7, 8, and 9 will show that the genitive in गापाटक् is really anomalous S प्रे दाक् and S गमि रश्च, the two sutras preceding S गापाटक्, and S हरतरनुचमनऽत्, the sutra that follows S गापाटक्, all of them put the *prakritis* or stems in the ablative case. And in S प्रे दाक्, the two roots have been given a singular ending to avoid the awkward and unwieldy form of the ablative dual—दाताभ्याम्. Then why should Panini bethink himself of using the genitive in S गापाटक् on the strength of the rule मुपा मुपा भवन्ति, which does not occur in the Aśtd, and which we may say was unknown to him ?

Thus the difficulty about the use of the genitive in the two sutras remains to be explained.

Thus we see that the *Paribhasa* आद्यन्ती टङ्गिती is not of universal application in the Aśtd. It does not hold good in the case of sutras like प्रेदिशान्याईक् and गापाटक्,

III & IV

तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य । I. i. 66.

Kasika.— तस्मिन्निति समर्थनिर्देशे पूर्वस्यैव कार्यं भवति नोत्तरस्य । इको यणचि । दध्युदकम् । मच्चिदम् । पचत्योदनम् । निर्दिष्टप्रहणमानन्तर्यार्थम् । अप्रिचिदत्रेति व्यग्रहितन्य मा भूत् ॥

तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य । I. i. 67.

Kasika:— निर्दिष्टप्रहणमनुवर्तते । तस्मादिति पञ्चमर्थनिर्देशः । उत्तरस्यैव कार्यं भवति न पूर्वस्य । तिङ्ङितिङः । ओदनं पचति । इह न भवति । पचत्योदनमिति ॥

Let us take these sutras separately and consider them. S 66 lays down that "when a term is exhibited in the seventh case in these sutras, the operation directed is to be understood as affecting the state of what immediately precedes that which the term denotes." Thus in the sutra "इको यणचि" (VI. i. 77.), the word 'अचि' is put in the locative case, and therefore the sutra means that इ, उ, ऋ, ल, followed by a vowel (अचि) are changed into ए, ओ, ए, ओ, (य), the literal translation of the sutra being — "Of इ there is यण् in ." The force of 'in' or the locative case being to induce changes in the letter preceding the vowel. Thus दधि + उदकम् = दध्युदकम्; so also मच्चिदम्, पचत्योदनम् ।

Now let us see whether this *paribhasa* is of universal application in the Aṣṭa. Many cases will occur to the reader in which this *paribhasa* is not observed; of them ऋद्वनोः स्ये (VII. ii. 70.) is one. Let us consider it.

ऋद्धनोः स्ये । VII. ii 70.

Kasika ;— ऋकारान्तानां घातूना हन्नेश्च स्ये इडागमो भवति ।
वरिष्यति । हनिष्यति । स्वरनेर्नेट्त्वाद्द्वयोः स्य इत्येतद्व्यति निप्रतिषेधेन ।
स्वरिष्यति । तपरक्वणं विषयार्थम् ॥

Now, according to this strict interpretation of the sutra, what form do we get, of हन् स्य निप्? Here the root हन् is followed by स्य, which is exhibited in the locative case in the sutra "ऋद्धनोः स्ये." According to the *paribhasa* "तन्मिप्रिति निदिष्टे पूर्वस्य", the ऋच् or the operation enjoined by this sutra, *viz.* the 'इडागमः,' is to be understood as affecting the state of what immediately precedes the स्य, *viz.* the roots ending in ऋ and the root हन्. And so the root हन् in this case, and not the *pratyaya* स्य, has इच् as an आगम. And this आगम comes at the beginning of the root हन् according to the *paribhasa*, "आग्रणी टङिनी". Therefore we have :— हन् स्य निप् = इद् हन् स्य निप् = इहंस्यति, which is absurd. To avoid this difficulty, the Siddhanta Kaumudi paraphrases the sutra as follows :— ऋर्नां हन्नेश्च स्यस्य इद् स्यात् ; and the Balaminoorana comments - ऋण हन् अनयं ईडागमस्यर्थे पठो । स्ये इति पठ्यर्थे गतमी. Thus the use of the locative in 'स्ये' is wrong. The word स्ये must be changed to स्यस्य and the word "ऋद्धनोः" to "ऋद्धन्याः" to give us the correct form हनिष्यति. Thus we see the sutra ऋद्धनोः स्ये is an exception to the *paribhasa*—तन्मिप्रिति निदिष्टे पूर्वस्य.

This exception needs explanation. The traditional explanation is that ऋद्धोऽन्तानां भवति, and that in the Chanda मुनो मुनो भवन्ति, and that here there is a पयस्यर्थे पठि. But

can we apply the analogy of the Chandas to the sūtras of the Aṣṭa ? The Chandas is not the work of one man or one age. The diversity in the use of cases in the Chandas is attributable to that cause. But how to apply the analogy of the Chandas to the Aṣṭa which is supposed to be the work of one single author, namely Pāṇini ?

Let us now proceed to the next *paribhasa*—तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य. It lays down —‘ When a sūtra enjoins some operation and in that sūtra a term is exhibited in the ablative case, the operation enjoined is to be understood as affecting the state of what follows immediately after the thing denoted by the word in the ablative case.

Let us for example consider the sūtra उद् स्थास्तम्भो पूर्वस्य । (VIII 17 61). This sūtra consists of three words viz उद् , स्थास्तम्भो and पूर्वस्य. It teaches the substitution of a पूर्वसवर्ण letter. Now in whose place is the substitution of the पूर्वसवर्ण letter to be made ? We get the answer to this question from the text of the sūtra itself, when we interpret it according to the *paribhasa*—‘ तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य ’. In the sūtra उद् स्थास्तम्भो पूर्वस्य, the word उद् is put in the ablative case. Therefore the operation enjoined by the sūtra must affect the state of what follows immediately after उद्, that is, it must affect the words स्था and तम्भ. So the substitution of the पूर्वसवर्ण letter is to be made in the place of the first letter (स्) of the words स्था and तम्भ (आदे परस्य I : 54). Thus उद् + स्थानम् = उत्स्थानम्.

Let us see whether this *paribhasa* has any exceptions. If we turn to S VI : 75, we shall find one. The sūtra reads—‘ दीर्घान् ’. The words छे and युक् are induced (अनुवृत्त)

from SS. VI. 1. 73 and 71 respectively. - 'तुक्' is an āgama and comes at the end, and forms the end-part, of the word to which it is added. Now 'दीर्घात्' is a word in the ablative, and so the paribhāṣā, तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य, applies. And what is the 'उत्तर' of 'दीर्घा' in the case of this sūtra? It is the letter उ. And strictly speaking the तुक् will be an āgama of उ, and all we get, not स्तेज्जति, which is correct, but स्तेजति, which is impossible. Kaṣyapa tries to escape from this difficulty thus:— दीर्घाच्चे तुक् भवतीत्यत्र (1) पदीम्याने व्यत्ययेन पञ्चमीनि व्याख्यातान् (2) सुराच्छाये-त्यादेशं ज्ञापकाद् दीर्घस्यैव तुभवति न तु ज्ञस्य । * But this explanation does not explain why the sūtra reads दीर्घात्, giving rise to so much difficulty, and not दीर्घस्य, which would not have contravened the paribhāṣā तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य, and so would have raised no difficulty. And this anomalous use of the ablative becomes the more glaring, when we compare the genitive in SS. नृस्यस्य विनि वृत्ति तुक् (VI. 1. 71) and आत्माद्योश्च (VI. 1. 74.)

Thus we see that the sūtra दीर्घात् (VI. 1. 75.) is an exception to the paribhāṣā तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य.

"पञ्चमीनिर्देशेन क्रियमाणं कार्यं वर्णान्तरेण अभ्यस्यति स्य परस्य ज्ञेयम् ।" Siddhanta Kaumudi. It is interesting to note that the whole of the chapter dealing with verbal accents is an exception to the paribhāṣā, as interpreted above.

'अत्र प्रकरणे (तिङन्तस्यप्रकरणे) पञ्चमीनिर्देशे विनान्तर्गताभाष्येनेह†'

V

स्वरितेनाधिकारः । I. iii. 11.

Kaṣṭha — स्वरितेनेति ह्यर्थमूनच्छने नृनीया । स्वरितो नाम स्यारिशेषो वर्णवर्मः । तेन सिद्धेनाधिकारो वेदिस्य । स्वरितगुणगुणं ऋद्धमपि ह्यनन्ता-

* Kaṣyapa at the end of his comment on तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य. I. 1. 67.

† Siddhanta Kaumudi on S. नृनानाहृतितमनुदात्तं वाहादित्यः VIII. 1. 67

दुत्तरश्रोपतिष्ठत । प्रतिज्ञास्वरिता चाणिनीया । प्रत्यय । घातो । ह्याप्प्राप्ति
पदिकात् । अङ्गस्य । अस्य । पदस्य ॥

'When in this collection of sutras, there is any sutra that has a circumflex accent, it denotes that it is the beginning of a topic or subject and the word marked with the svarita accent presents itself that is is to be understood in the subsequent sutras' But there occur strangely enough some cases where a word in a subsequent sutra presents itself in a previous sutra. For example —

इंग से ॥ VII. ॥ 77

इङ्गनाज्जे च ॥ VII ॥ 78

Siddhanta Kaumudi— इङ्गीङ्गना मध्येऽङ्गना सार्वपातुक्कारिद
स्यात् । योगविभागा वैचित्र्यार्थ ॥

Latturabodhans — यथाभूतमृत्न्यासे इङ्गा ङ्गेऽदे परे इङ्गिष्वामिति न
सिद्धयेदत आह—इङ्गीङ्गनामिति । वैचित्र्यार्थ इति । एव इत्यस्य पूर्वव्यापक्यं ।
से इत्यस्योत्तरव्यापक्यमित्येव विचित्रव्यापार्थ ॥

Now let us turn to the Bhasya and see what Katayana and Patanjali have to say about this sutra स्वरितेनाधिकार .

भाष्यम् — किमर्थमिदमुच्यते ? ।

वातिकम् — अधिकार प्रतियोग तस्यानिर्देशार्थं ।

भाष्यम् — अधिकार त्रयते प्रतियोग तस्यानिर्देशार्थं इति ॥ किमिदं
प्रतियोगमिति ? । याग योग प्रति प्रतियोगम् । यागे योग तस्य ग्रहण मा कार्य
मिति ॥ किं गतमेतदियता सूत्रेण ? । गतमित्याह ॥ कुत ? । लोकेत ॥ तस्य
लोके “अधिकृताऽसौ ग्राम” “अधिकृतोऽसौ नगरे” इत्युच्यत या यत्र
व्यापार गच्छति । शब्देन चाप्यधिकृतन वाऽऽया व्यापार शक्योऽवगन्तुमपरतो
योग याग उपस्थानात् ॥

वातिकम् — न वा निर्दिश्यमानाधिकृतत्वात्पक्षे लोके ॥

भाष्यम् — न वा एतत्प्रयोजनमस्ति ॥ किं कारणम् ? । निर्दिश्यमानाधि
कृतत्वात् । यथा लोके । निर्दिश्यमानमाधिकृत गम्यते । तदथा— देवदत्ताय गौर्द्वय

ताम् 'यद्दत्ताय' 'दिष्णुमित्राय' इति । गौरिति गम्यते । एवमिहापि "पदरज
विशस्पृशो घञ्" "सु स्थिरे" "भावे" घञिति गम्यते ॥

वार्तिकम् — अन्यनिर्देशस्तु निवर्तकस्तस्मात्परिभाषा ॥

भाष्यम् — अन्यनिर्देशस्तु लोके निवर्तको भवति । तथा 'देवदत्ताय
गौर्दीयताम्' 'दिष्णुमित्राय कम्बल' इति कम्बले गौर्निवर्तको भवति । एवमिहापि
"अभिविधौ भाव इदुण्" घञो निवर्तकः स्यात् तस्मात्परिभाषा कर्तव्या ॥

वार्तिकम् — अधिकारपरिमाणज्ञान ॥

भाष्यम् — अधिकारपरिमाणज्ञानं तु भवति । न ज्ञायते कियन्तमवापि
मधिकारोऽनुवर्तते इति ॥

वार्तिकम् — अधिकारपरिमाणज्ञानार्थं तु ।

भाष्यम् — अधिकारपरिमाणज्ञानार्थं एव तर्हि अयं योगी वक्तव्यः ।
अधिकारपरिमाणं ज्ञास्यामीति ॥ यथ पुन "स्वरितेनाविकार" इत्यनेनाविकार-
परिमाणं शक्यं विज्ञातुम् ? । एव वक्ष्यामि— "स्वरिते नाविकार" इति । स्वरित
वृद्धाविकारो न भवतीति ॥ केनेदानीमधिकारो भविष्यति ? । लौकिकोऽधिकारः ॥

वार्तिकम् — नाविकार इति चेदुक्तम् ॥

भाष्यम् — किञ्चुक्तम् ? । "अन्यनिर्देशस्तु निवर्तकस्तस्मान् परिभाषा"
इति ॥ अधिकारार्थमेव तर्क्यं योगी वक्तव्यः । ननु चोक्त "अधिकारपरिमाणं
ज्ञानं तु" इति ? ।

वार्तिकम् — यावत्तिथोऽनुवक्ष्यस्तावतो योगानिति वचनारिसद्वत् ॥

भाष्यम् — यावत्तिथोऽनुवक्ष्यते तावतो योगानाधिकारोऽनुवर्तते इति वक्त-
व्यम् ॥ अथेदानीं यद्वाच्यं यासोऽल, भूयसश्च योगानाधिकारोऽनुवर्तते, यथ तत्र
कर्तव्यम् ? ॥

वार्तिकम् — भूयसि प्राग्वचनम् ॥

With this Vārtika Kātyāyana has finished his discussion
of this sūtra. Let us briefly state the conclusions he has
arrived at —

(1) The svarita' marks the governing word. So a svarita
stands at the commencement of a domain.

(2) The serial number (प्रत्याहारक्रमेण Uddyota) of the letter which is used as the *anubandha* of the governing word indicates the number of sūtras which the word governs

(3) In case the number of sūtras which are to be governed by a word exceeds the serial number of any letter in the governing word then the use of the word 'प्राग्' is made and when not made already in the sūtra, ought to be made (cf. Bhasya — भूयसि प्राग्वचनं कर्तव्यम् । प्रागमुत इति वक्तव्यम् ।)

Now let us see how far the last of the rules is observed in the Aśd. We come across sūtras like 'प्राग्वतेष्टक्' 'प्रागिवात्' 'प्राग्वितोयत्' etc. where the author of the sūtras indicates the extent of the domains of the various affixes by the use of the word 'प्राक्'. But in sūtras like 'अगम्य' (VI. iv 1), the use of 'प्राक्', though quite necessary to indicate the extent of the 'Adbikāra' is not made. Therefore Katayana tells us that, where the use of the word 'prāk', though necessary, is not made we ought to insert it into the text of the sūtra. (cf. Bhasya — भूयसि प्राग्वचनं कर्तव्यम् । प्रागमुत इति वक्तव्यम्.) Thus Katayana noted that there was no uniformity in the Aśd with regard to the use of the word 'prāk', to indicate the extent of the domain and he proposed to insert the word 'prak', whenever necessary, into the text of the sūtra.

In this connection the following observations of a Nैयायika quoted in the Nyāsa are interesting —

“नैयायिक इत्याह — कश्चिदर्थोऽविहितेन गृह्यते यथा—आहंद् भवनादिति । कश्चिप्रत्यय 'प्राग्वते' 'आचम्वान्' इति । कश्चित्प्रकृति 'आकटारान्' इति । कश्चिदेवदेग 'प्राग्वीव्यतोऽण्' इति । कश्चिनिखाधि प्रत्यय 'न्याप्प्रातिपदि षाद्' इति । तेनायमालम्बनो वैचित्र्यमाचार्यो दर्शयतीत्यनसीयते = Nyāsa V 1. 1

Thus the Naiyāyika comes to the conclusion that the Acārya exhibits his vaicitrya or whimsicality *

Is the absence of uniformity in the use of the word *वाक्* in the sutras to indicate the extent of an अधिकार or domain due to the वैचित्र्य of the author of the 3rd or is it due to the conditions under which he worked ?

We have seen above, that Kātyāyana proposes to add words to the effect 'वागयुन', wherever necessary, to the existing text of sutras and in this extent he proposes to meddle with the text of the sutras. This Patañjali does not relish and so he tries to defend the existence of the sutra *स्वरितेनाधिकार* on other grounds which are summarised at the end of his Bhasya on the sutra in the following gāthā —

अधिकारगतिस्त्वर्थो विज्ञेयायापि कार्यम् ।

अथ दान्वापि वार पूर्वविज्ञानिवेषार्थे न ॥

These प्रयोगस of the sutra should be rejected mainly on two grounds. First they have no support from tradition otherwise Kātyāyana would have known them and dealt with them in his *Ārśika* and they seem to have been unknown to *Vartikakāras* other than Kātyāyana also otherwise Patañjali would have quoted them, as he quotes the *Saṃśaya* etc. Secondly in order to have the प्रयोगस mentioned in the gāthā Patañjali proposes to imagine 'स्वरा' where it did not exist in the text of the 3rd as given to him by tradition. Thus on the first of the three प्रयोगस he writes —

“अधिकारगति — गोविशोऽनमर्त्तव्येयत्र गान्धर्पद्वयम् अदिनम् ।

नन कर्त्तव्यं मानि । अदिनम् स्वरादिपदम् ।” No *स्वरा* are used in

* As to who this Naiyāyika is compare —

“वैश्वमीयवद्वैतं सुखनवानुनामिभि ।

आदि विज्ञापितं यथैव संप्रदयनिवृत्ते ॥ *Vakya-radīya* II. 457.

‘स्वरयिष्यते’ It shows that the ‘ख्यिहण’ had no svarita in the text of the Aṣṭd as given by tradition to Patañjali. Similarly he further on says — “अधिक कार । पूर्वविप्रतिषेधाच्च न पठित्या भवन्ति—‘गुणवृद्धयैस्त्वृज्’ द्वावभ्यां तु पूर्वविप्रतिषिद्धम्” ‘तुमचिरवृद्धवद्वावभ्यो हृद्’ इति । तुमुगौ स्वरयिष्यते । तत्र स्वरितेनाधिक कारो भविष्यतीति तुमुगौ भविष्यत ।” Note again the word ‘स्वरयिष्यते’ The remarks made above on ‘स्वरयिष्यत’ apply here also. Moreover Patañjali seems himself to have been dissatisfied with this explanation of the Pūrvavipratishedhas. For further on, under S ‘विप्रतिषेधे पर कार्यम्’, where this topic of Vipratishedhas has been principally dealt with he defends Pūrvavipratishedhas on other grounds by taking the word ‘पर’ in S ‘विप्रतिषेधे पर कार्यम्’ to mean ‘इष्ट’ (see p. 36).

We shall consider one more Paribhāṣā viz. ‘यथासंख्यमनुदश समानाम्’, and shall finish with this chapter dealing with the Paribhāṣas.

VI

यथासंख्यमनुदश समानाम् । I : 10

Kuṣka — सम्प्राप्त-इदं क्रमादङ्गणे । यथासंख्यं यथाक्रममनुदशो भवति । अनुदशेयत इत्यनुदश । पञ्चादुच्यते इत्यर्थः । समाना समसंख्यानां समपरिपठितानामुदाशिनानमुदाशिनानां च यथाक्रमशुश्रूषिभिरनुदशेन सचक्ष्यन्ते । नृदीशठातुरवर्मतीक्ष्णवाराङ्गद्वन्द्वद्वयम् । प्रथमात्प्रथमो द्वितीयाद्वितीय इत्यादि । तौदश । शाठातुरीय । वामतय । कौचवार्य । समानामिति किम् । लङ्गणेत्यभूताख्यानभागवत्प्राप्त प्रतिपर्यन्तम् । लङ्गणादयश्चत्वारोऽर्थो । प्रत्यादयश्च । सर्वेषां सर्वत्र कर्मप्रवचनीयमज्ञा भवति । इह कस्मान् न भवति—“वेधोपशब्दादेर्मोहायन्त्य च” इति । स्वरितन लिङ्गन यथासरणम् । यत्र नेष्यते तत्र स्वरितत्वं न प्रतिज्ञायते । स्वरितनाधिकार (I iii 11) इति स्वरितग्रहणं पूर्वेणापि सचक्ष्यते ॥

When a rule involves the case of an equal number of *karyas* and *kāryins* their mutual correspondence or assignment each to each is according to the order of enumeration.

It is laid down in III. 1. 34. (नन्दिप्रदिपचादिभ्या ल्युणिन्पच) that the affixes 'ल्यु', 'णिनि' and 'अच्' are added to the 'नन्दि', the 'प्रदि', and the 'पच्' classes of words. Now the question arises whether each of the three classes of words takes all the three affixes or two only or one only. And further if each class takes only two affixes or only one, then which one or two of the three does it take? Now here there is 'अनियम'. The paribhāṣā "यथासत्यमनुदेश समानाम्" comes in and tells us exactly how to add the affixes. The affix ल्यु is to be added to the words of the 'नन्दि' class 'णिनि' to the words of the 'प्रदि' class and 'अच्' to the words of the 'पच्' class. The addition must be respectively according to the order of enumeration of the 'prakṛas' and the 'pratyayas' in the sūtra and not as one pleases.

Even this very simple paribhāṣā is not without exceptions. One exception is pointed out by the Kaśika (I iii 10) in the sentence:—इह कस्मान्न भगति "उत्तापसभादेर्मंगायन्त्य च" इति ।. However, the reading of the sūtra in the Bhāṣya and the Siddhānta Kaumudī is 'वेत्तापसभादेर्मंगायन्त्य' (IV iv 131). On this sūtra the Siddhānta Kaumudī remarks:—यथासत्यमनुदेशे । The sūtra कर्तृवर्मणोश्च भूवर्मो (III iii 127) is another exception. The Siddhānta Kaumudī again remarks — यथासत्यमनुदेशे ।

The Bhāṣya on this sūtra falls into three main parts as divided by the editor of the Nirṇayasāgara edition. First we have the "उदाहरणादिहरण" where the question as to what are the right illustrations of the application of the sūtra is settled. Secondly we have the 'सूत्रप्रपादनादिहरण', which explains the *raison d'être* of the sūtra. Thirdly and this is the most important part of the Bhāṣya we have the 'समस्यानामुद्देशविपरिणामादिहरण', which considers the field for the operation of the 'Yathāśaukhyā paribhāṣā'. We are here

concerned only with this third 'adhikaraṇa'. In this adhikaraṇa two possibilities are considered, first, 'Yathāśankhya' when there is 'शब्दतः साम्य' or equality in the number of words, and secondly, 'Yathāśankhya' when there is 'अर्थतः साम्य', or equality of the number things denoted by the words. It is shown that whichever of the two alternatives we adopt for the sūtra, there will remain some exceptions to its application. Some of these exceptions to the 'ś'abdataḥ sāmya' pakṣa are removed by taking the peribhāṣā to apply only in those cases where there is 'samānayaogavacana', i. e. where both the kāryas and the kāryins are to be found mentioned in one and the same sūtra. (cf. Vārtika — "न वा सामान्योऽवचनात्"). But even if we accept this 'Ś'abdataḥ sāmya pakṣa' with the qualification of the 'ś'amānayaogavacana', there still remain some cases to which the 'Yathāśankhya' rule does not apply. Thus there are exceptions if we adopt the 'arthataḥ sāmya' alternative, and there are exceptions if we adopt the 'ś'abdataḥ sāmya' alternative, with the qualification of the 'samānayaogavacana'. Both these pakṣas or alternatives and the difficulties in the way of accepting either of them are pointed out by Kātyāyana and he leaves the matter there. And the Bhāṣyakāra rightly sums up the position of Kātyāyana in the words — तस्मादात्मिन् पक्षेऽप्येवमसौ दोषास्तमास्थाय प्रतिविधेयं दीपेयम् ।

But Patanjali was unwilling to leave the matter at this stage. So he goes on to say :—

अथैवं वक्ष्यामि "यथामसंख्यमनुदेशः समाना स्वरितेन" ततः "अधिकारः" अधिकारश्च भवति स्वरितेनेति ॥ एतदपि स्वरितं दृष्ट्वा संदेहः स्यात्—न शायते—किमयं समसंख्यार्थ आहोस्विदधिकारार्थ इति ॥ सन्देहमात्रमेतद्व्यतिरेकः । सर्वसन्देहप्रतिषेधेन चैवमप्यतिष्ठते 'व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपात्तिर्न हि सन्देहादलक्षणम्' इति । समसंख्यार्थ इति व्याख्यास्यामः ॥

The weakness of this explanation of Patanjali's is quite evident. The fact that Kātyāyana or any other Vārtikakāra did not know of it shows that it is not supported by tradition or paramparā. The weakest point in his explanation is pointed out by Patanjali himself saying—एवमपि स्वरित इद्वा मन्त्रे म्यान् e'tc. To get out of this difficulty he falls back on vyakhyāna.

A paribhāṣā is defined as 'अनियमे नियमचारिणी'. Then if by a svarita Pāṇini taught us that we should know that an adhikāra begins (I iii 11) and also that in some cases there is the application of the 'Yathāśaukhyā' rule then of what use would the svarita be? So Patanjali's explanation is unacceptable.

Thus it will be seen that whatever the interpretation we adopt for the 'Yathāśaukhyā' rule it has still some exceptions. The 'Yathāśaukhyā' rule is not of universal application in the Aśtā. And this is a fact which demands an explanation.

We have now finished with the sūtras relating to the Paribhāṣās. We have seen that in the Aśtā there is not a single important Paribhāṣa that has not important exceptions. What is this due to?

CHAPTER IV

THE SANJNĀS IN THE AṢṬD

HAVING dealt with some of the most important Paribhāṣasūtras, we shall now turn to the Sanjñāsūtras, and see how far the Aṣṭd. is uniform in its use of the sanjñās or technical terms.

1. अपृक्त एकाक्षरस्य । I. ii 41.

This sūtra tells us that 'an affix consisting of a single letter is called अपृक्त'. In this sūtra it is to be noted the word अपृक्त is masculine in gender. But in sūtra इन्द्रयाज्यो दीर्घतिस्यपृक्तं इह ! (VI. i 68), the word अपृक्त is neuter. It should not be deemed that the difference between the two sūtras as regards the gender of 'अपृक्त' is of little importance. Some words seem to have been common to the various schools of grammar at the time of Pāṇini, sometimes exhibiting a difference only in gender. Thus the word सार्वधातुकम् is used as a neuter noun in the Aṣṭd., cf. तिङ्शित् सार्वधातुकम् । (III. iv. 113). But with the Āpiś'ālas it was feminine in gender, cf. हेरशुशम्भः सार्वधातुकाह वृद्धसि, quoted in Kaśika VII m. 95. as an Āpiś'āla sūtra. It is interesting to note that in the Rkprātis'ākhyā 11-2 the word अपृक्त is used as a neuter noun cf. अपृक्तवेकाक्षरमद्विषोनि यन् ।

2 In S I iv. 3., गृम्याख्यौ नदी, it is laid down that "नदी" is the technical term for feminine nouns ending in ई or ऊ. But in S. II. i 20 (नदीष्वेव), and S. V iv 110 (नदीष्वैर्णमास्पाद्यहायगीभ्य) and in many other sūtras the word नदी is used in its common dictionary sense of a river.

3. कर्तुंशिक्षिततम कर्म I. iv. 49. The word 'कर्मन्' is used in this sense in S. I. iv. 32 (कर्मणा यमाभिप्रैति स सम्प्रदानम्) etc. But in S. I. iii. 14. the word कर्मन् is used in the sense of क्रिया

कर्तरि कर्मव्यतिहारः ॥ I. iii. 14.

वातिकर्म—क्रियान्यतिहारः ॥

भाष्यम्—क्रियाव्यतिहार इति वक्ष्यम् । कर्मव्यतिहार इत्युच्यमाने हापि प्रसज्येत-देवदत्तस्य धान्यं व्यतिहनुन्तीति । इह च न स्यात्-व्यतिहनुते, व्यतिहनुत इति ॥

Kātyāyana rightly lays down that a particular exclusive meaning having been attached to the word कर्मन् by S. I. iv. 49 the use of the word कर्मन् in this sūtra is misleading and that the word क्रिया should be substituted for the word कर्मन् in the sūtra. It is true that Patanjali tries to defend the use of the word कर्मन् in the sūtra, but Patanjali's long and elaborate argument itself in defence of the use of the word is its condemnation and shows clearly that the use of the word कर्मन् in S. I. iii. 14. is misleading.

4. करण is defined as-साधकतमं करणम् I. iv. 42. But this definition does not apply to the word करण in S. III. i. 17 (यद्येवैरकलहाधकण्यमेधेभ्यः करणे), where 'करण' means 'क्रिया'.

5. एववचनं सम्बुद्धिः I. iii. 49

Kaśika — आमिश्रितप्रथमाया यदेववचनं तत्सम्बुद्धिसंज्ञं भवति ।

But this definition does not apply to the word सम्बुद्धि in — एकश्रुति दूरात्सम्बुद्धौ ॥ I. ii. 33.

Kaśika — दूरात्सम्बोधयति येन वाक्येन तत्संबोधनं संबुद्धिः । नैववचनं सम्बुद्धिः ॥

Nyāsa — संबोधनं सम्बुद्धिरित्यादिना सम्बुद्धिरित्यन्वयपक्षम् । न पारिभाषिकं सम्बुद्धिग्रहणमिति दर्शयति ॥

6. आधारोपकरणम् I. iv. 45

Kaśika — आधियन्तेस्मिन्क्रिया इत्याधारः । कर्तृकर्मणो. क्रियाभय-पूतयोः पारणक्रियां प्रति य आधारस्तत्कारकं अचिकरणसंज्ञं भवति ॥

Siddhanta Kaumudī — कर्तृत्वमद्वारा तन्निष्ठत्रियायाः आधारः कारक-
मधिकरणसंज्ञं भवति ॥

But this definition does not apply to the word अधिकरण in sutras like अधिकरणैतावत्त्वे च (II. iv. 15), where the word अधिकरण means वृत्तिपदार्थ (vide Kāśika on the sutra), and in sutras like पूर्वपरावरोत्तरमेकदेशिनैकाधिकरणे (II. iii. 1), अधिकरण-
विचाले च (IV. iii. 43) and विप्रतिषिद्धं चानधिकरणदात्रे (II. iv. 13), where the word अधिकरण means द्रव्य or substance. It is true that the commentators try to bring out all these various senses from the word 'आधार' which is the definition of 'अधिकरण' given in S. I. iv. 45. But we must remember that the definition occurs in the domain of 'कारके' I. iv. 23 and the Kāśikā and the Kaumudī rightly point out that the word 'आधार' refers only to the कारकाधार.

(इत्संज्ञासूत्रम्)

7 बुद्धि I. iii. 7.

Kaṇva — चवर्गद्वयगौ प्रत्ययस्यारी इत्संज्ञौ भवतः ॥

वार्तिकम्. — चुञ्चुप्चणपोश्चकारप्रतिषेधः ।

भाष्यम्. — चुञ्चुप्चणपोश्चकारस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । केचुञ्चु । केच
चण्. ॥

वार्तिकम्. — इदर्याभावात् सिद्धम् ।

भाष्यम्. — इत्कार्याभावादवेत्संज्ञा न भविष्यति । इदमस्तीत्कार्यम् । चित् ;
अन्त उदानो भवतीति अन्तोदात्तत्वं यथा म्यान् ॥

पित्करणमिदानीं किमर्थं स्यात् ।

वार्तिकम्. — पित्करणं किमर्थमिति चेत्पर्यायार्थम् ।

भाष्यम्. — पित्करणं किमर्थमिति चेत्पर्यायार्थमेतत्स्यात् ।

एवं तर्हि यकारादी चुञ्चुप्चणपौ । किं यकारो न भ्रूयते । दुष्प्रतिषिद्धो

यकारः ॥

Patanjali's explanation of why the 'च्' is not to be regarded as इत् or indicatory in the two *pratyayas* चुञ्चुप् and चणप्, is very unsatisfactory.

8. इदियंम्याचामादिस्तद्वदम् ॥ I. 1. 73.

But this definition does not apply to the word इद in—
इदस्य च पुत्रायाम् ॥ IV. 1. 166.

Kaṣṭha:—अपत्यमन्तर्दिने इदमिति शास्त्रान्तरे परिभाषणान् गोत्रं इद-
मिदमुच्यते ।

In his Bhāṣya on S. I. 11 68, Patañjali informs us that
“पूर्वमूत्रे गोत्रस्य इदमिति संज्ञा विद्यते ।”

(9) प्रथमानिर्दिष्टे समाम उपसर्जनम् ॥ I. 11. 43. Siddhānta
Kaṣṭha:—समामग्रात्रे प्रथमानिर्दिष्टे उपसर्जनसंज्ञं ध्यात् ।

But this word उपसर्जन is in S. IV. 1 14 (अनुपसर्जनात्),
used in the simple non technical sense of ‘apradhūna’ or ‘not
principal’. In this connection the following passage from the
Bhāṣya on S. IV. 1 14 (अनुपसर्जनात्) is very interesting —

पार्थिवम्:—पूर्वमूत्रनिर्देशो वायुमादिगन्धमधीन इति ॥

भाष्यम्:—पूर्वमूत्रनिर्देशो वा पुनस्य इदस्य । पूर्वमूत्रे अप्रधानम्योपसर्जन-
मिति संज्ञा विद्यते । यादृक्ष्यान् प्रधानादुत्पन्नस्यप्रधानात्रेति तावदुपसर्जना
इति । किं प्रयोजनम् । भाषिगन्धमधीने प्राप्ताणी । अणन्तादीकारो मा भूदिति ॥

We have the authority of Panini himself for the asser-
tion that the word उपसर्जन was used in the works of पुराचार्यः
in the sense of ‘अप्रधान’ or ‘not principal’ —

कारोपसर्जने च तुल्यम् ॥ I. 11. 57.

Kaṣṭha — अत्रिष्यमिति वर्जने । कारोपसर्जने चात्रिष्ये । इत्यम् ।
अर्थस्यान्यप्रमाणत्वात् । इदम्ये वैयाकरणे कारोपसर्जनयोः परिभाषां पूर्वमिति ।
..... तथोपसर्जनपरिभाषां पूर्वमिति अप्रधानमपसर्जनमिति । तन्वाजि

निराचार्यं प्रत्याचष्टे ॥

Conclusion — The Aṣṭd. is not uniform in its use of
technical terms.

CHAPTER V

THE USE OF CASES AND OF SYNONYMS, THE NIPĀTANAS AND THE METRICAL SŪTRAS IN THE AṢṬA

1. *The use of cases*—Let us consider the following sūtras from Pāda III, Ādhyāya VIII.

निनदीभ्यां स्नातेः कौशले । 89.

Ṭasika — निनदीभ्यामुत्तरस्य स्नातिसकारस्य मूर्धन्यादेशो भवति कौशले सम्प्रदाने । निष्णातः कटकरण ।

मूर्धं प्रतिष्णातम् । 90

Ṭasika — प्रतिष्णातमिति निपात्यते । मूर्धं खेद्वयति । प्रतिष्णातं मूर्धम् । छन्दमित्यर्थः । प्रतिस्नातमित्येवाप्यत्र ॥

कपिष्ठो गोत्रे । 91

Kasika — कपिष्ठ इति निपात्यते गोत्रविषये ।

प्रक्षेपणमिति । 92.

Ṭasika — प्रक्ष इति निपात्यते अप्रक्षमिष्यमिष्ये ।

दृष्टासनयोर्विहरः । 93

Kasika — विहर इति निपात्यते दृष्टे आसने च वाच्ये ।

उन्मोनात्रि च । 94.

Kasika — विहर इति निपात्यते ।

गत्रिषुपिभ्यां स्थिरः । 95.

Kasika — गत्रिषुपिभ्यामुत्तरस्य स्थिरसकारस्य मूर्धन्यादेशो भवति । गत्रिषिरः । सुपिष्ठिरः ।

In the first sūtra, the root स्ना which is the वार्तिन् and the न् of which is to be changed to प् is put in the genitive case, but in the last sūtra, the word स्थिरः which is the वार्तिन्

and the *म्* of which is to be changed to *व्*, is put in the nominative case; why is there this discrepancy in the use of cases, of which the above is only an instance, so very prevalent in the *Āstā*?

2 *The Nipatanas*.— Sūtras 90 to 95 (both inclusive) are *निरातनः*. Why are these sūtras put in the form of *निरातनः*? Could Panini not have written :—

प्रनेः जानम्य मूत्रे ।
 कपेः म्यङ्म्य गोत्रे ।
 प्राप्स्योऽपगामिनि ।
 वेः स्वरम्य वृक्षामनयो ।

on the analogy of “*निरातन्यां न्याने कौमने*”? Why should *निरातनः* intervene between rules expressed in the regular analytic form? And even among the *निरातन* sūtras, there is no uniformity. In S. 90, the word *मूत्र* which is the *वाच्य* of the word *प्रनिष्पान* is put in the nominative case. But in sūtra 95, the words *वृक्ष* and *आमन*, which are the *वाच्य* of the word *वेष्टर* are put in the locative case. How to account for all this irregularity?

3 *Metrical Sūtras*.— Some sūtras in the *Āstā*, taken singly or together with a preceding or following sūtra or sūtras seem to fall into metre. For example— S. *वृद्धिरादैच्* I. 1. 1. and S. *अदेद्गुण* I. 1. 2. read together make ‘*वृद्धिरादैवदेद्गुण*’ which is a quarter of an *अनुष्टुप्* verse

S. *दिवो यावा* VI. III. 29. and S. *दिवसश्च पृथिव्याम्* VI. III. 30., read together make “*दिवो यावा दिवसश्च पृथिव्याम्*” which is the fourth line of a verse, the metre of which is that of the following verse from the *Rikprātis’ākhya* :—

संहिता पदमृनि पदान्तात्
 पदादिभिः सन्धयेति यत्मा ।

कालान्यवायेन स्वरान्नरंतु

विट्ति सा वा स्वरभक्तिकाळा ॥ II 1.

S. इत्तेदृतिनाथयो पशौ । II ॥ 25 is a quarter of a verse in the वैताडीय metre.

A thorough search of the whole Aśtd. will give us many more instances of such metrical sutras. But let us consider the three instances given above more closely.

ट्टिरादैमदेद्गुण । In this connection the following remarks of Patanjali on I. 1. 1. are interesting :—

अथवा पूर्वोच्चारित. संज्ञा परोच्चारिता संज्ञा । कुत एतन् । सतो हि कार्पिणः कार्येण भवितव्यतम् । तस्या—इतरत्रापि सती मासपिण्डस्य देवस्य इति संज्ञा त्रियते ॥ कथं ट्टिरादैजिति । एतदेकमाचार्यस्य मद्गुणार्थं सूच्यताम् ।
.. सर्वत्रैव हि ध्याकरण पूर्वोच्चारित. संज्ञा, परोच्चारिता संज्ञा 'भदेद्गुण' इति यथा ॥

Thus S. I. 1. 1 ought to have read भदैजट्टि, instead of ट्टिरादैष् । Is it possible, pace Patanjali, that the irregularity is caused by the exigencies of metre ?

दिवो यात्रा दिवसश्च दृष्टव्याम् । Why is the word दिवस used and not दिवम् which would have been more correct and easy for comprehension ? The Kāśikā (VI. iii. 30) says :— " अकारोच्चारणं सकारस्य विकाराभावाप्रतिपक्षार्थम् । " But this end could have been achieved still better by reading the sūtra as दिवमृष्टव्याम् Cf. Candrā V ii 37.

दिवमृष्टव्यां वा ।

इति :— सकारनिरोधो व्याभावात् ।

So, it seems, the word दिवस and not दिवम् is used to meet the exigencies of metre.

हरतेदृतिनाथयो पञ्चौ ।

Kanika — दृति नाथ इत्येतयोः कर्मणोरुपपदयोः, हरतेर्वातो पञ्चौ कर्तरि इत्प्रत्ययो भवति ॥

Thus 'दृति' and 'नाथ' are उपपदs. Now consider the following sutra

सुपि स्प. । III. ॥ 4 .

Kanika .— सुबन्त उपपदे तिष्ठने कप्रत्ययो भवति ।

Here the upapada (सुपि) comes first and then follows the root (स्था) to which the pratyaya is to be added.

तुन्दशोऽयोः परिभृजापदयोः । III. ॥ 5

Kanika — तुन्दशोऽयोः कर्मणोरुपपदयोः परिभृजापदयोर्वातो कप्रत्ययो भवति ।

Here also the upapadas come first in the sutra and then the roots to which the pratyaya is to be added.

स्तम्बरुणयोः रमिजयोः । III. ॥ 13

Here also the upapadas (स्तम्ब and रुण) come first and then follow the roots (रम् and जय)

पुरोऽयतोऽथैव सत्तैः । III. ॥ 18.

The upapadas come first and then comes the root (मृ).

हरतेदृतिनाथयोः पञ्चौ । III. ॥ 25.

Here the root (हृ) comes first and then come the upapadas (दृति and नाथ).

नासिकाम्ननयोऽर्ष्मावेदो । III. ॥ 29.

Here the upapadas (नासिका and स्तन) come first and then the roots (अर्ष्मा and वेद).

Thus it will be seen that S. 'हरतेदृतिनाथयोः पञ्चौ' is irregular in its arrangement of the upapada and the root. Is this irregularity caused by the exigencies of metre?

4 *The synonyms in the Aśtd.* — In the Aśtd. the Ved c literature is referred to promi ciously with the words एन्दम, मन्त्र and निगम and the notion of 'option' is expressed indist criminately with the words वा, उभयथा, अन्यतरस्याम्, विभाषा and बहुलम् For 'substance' four words are used- द्रव्य (V. iv. 11) सत्त्व (I. iv 57) अधिकरण (V. iii. 43) and बन्धु (V iv 9). †



† विभेतिद्वयथादात्म्यद्रव्यप्रत्यये ॥ V. iv. 11.

आदयोऽसरे ॥ I iv 57

Kaṇḍa — सत्त्वमिति द्रव्यमुच्यते ।

अधिकरणविधाते च ॥ V. iii 43.

Kaṇḍa — अधिकरणं द्रव्यम् ।

जात्यगताय बन्धुनि ॥ V. iv. 9.

Kaṇḍa — बन्धुप्रत्ययेन द्रव्यमुच्यते ।

CHAPTER VI

THE MANDUKAPLUTI THE PARTICLE च AND THE YOGAVIBHĀGA

I

The Mandukapluti—Let us consider the following three sutras from the first Pāda of the third Adhyāya

सुष भात्मन क्यच् ॥ ८ ॥

Kaśika—इविकर्मणं णितुरेतात्ममन्वन्विन सुवन्तादिच्छायामर्थे वा क्यच् प्रत्ययो भवति ।

काम्यच्च ॥ ९ ॥

Kaśika—सुवन्तात्कर्मणं भात्मेच्छाया काम्यच् प्रत्ययो भवति । योग-विभाग उत्तरं क्यचोऽनुवर्णार्थः ॥

उपमानादाचारः ॥ १० ॥

Kaśika—क्यजनुवर्तते न काम्यच् । उपमानात्कर्मणं सुवन्तादाचारेऽर्थे वा क्यच् प्रत्ययो भवति ॥

It will be noticed that in sutra 10, it is क्यच् that is anuvṛta and not काम्यच् 'क्यच्' occurs in sutra ८ and 'काम्यच्' in sutra ९. Therefore it is काम्यच् that ought to have been anuvṛta in sutra 10, and not क्यच्. How to account for this anomaly? The Kāśikā answers thus—योगविभाग उत्तरं क्यचोऽनुवर्णार्थः । The Nyāsa explaining this says—ननु द्वावप्येतौ क्यचोऽनुवर्णार्थौ सुवन्तात्कर्मणं भात्मेच्छाया विधीयते । तदेकयोगे न कथं न कृत इत्याह—योगविभाग इत्यादि । सुष भात्मन क्यच् काम्यचाविन्विकयोगे ननु उत्तरं द्वावप्यनुवर्तते म्यान् ॥ ननु च योगविभागोऽपि आनन्तर्यान् काम्यच्च णानुवर्तते म्यान् । न तु क्यच्च ॥ नैव दोषः । चकारादत्र क्रियते क्यचोऽनुवर्णार्थः । तदनुवर्णार्थम्यतः प्रयोजनम् । उत्तरानुवर्तितर्यथा म्यान् । इह प्रयोजनभावात् ॥ काम्यजपि कम्मात्रानुवर्तते इति चेत् । योगविभागसामर्थ्यात् ॥

इश् नीडिकालयो । [+ ण्यद् and not यन्]

Now let us see in which of the two triads the anuvṛttis are more natural and correct. A little consideration will make it clear that the anuvṛttis in the second triad are the more natural and so the correct ones. In the first sūtra of the second triad viz. 'गम्यकन्', the prakṛti (ग) and the pratyaya (कन्) are both given, in the second only the pratyaya (ण्यद्) with the word 'च' added. Now what else can the function of 'च' in S. 'ण्यद् च' be, but the anukarṣaṇa of the prakṛti which is necessary to complete the sense of the sūtra (ण्यद् च)? Thus the first sūtra tells us that the root 'गै' takes 'कन्' as an affix denoting agent. The next sūtra says—'ण्यद् च'. Here only the affix (ण्यद्) is given and so a prakṛti is needed to complete the sense. Therefore does the Kāś'ikā rightly say:— चकारेण ग इत्यनुहृष्यते. In the next (third) sūtra only the prakṛti (इ : a. the root इ) is given and what is required to complete the sense of the sūtra in this case is the pratyaya. Therefore does the Kāś'ikā on this sūtra say:— चकारेण ण्यदनुहृष्यते.

Thus it will be seen that by the word 'च' in a sūtra, that part of a previous sūtra which is needed to complete the sense of the subsequent sūtra is inducted. So we may confidently say that the function of 'च' in sūtra 'काम्यच् च' is to induct—not 'क्यच्' which is admittedly useless in the sūtra (इह प्रयोजनाभावात्. Nyāsa)—but "सुप्र आत्मन.", which is the prakṛti needed by the pratyaya 'काम्यच्', to complete the sense of the sūtra.

The form of these triads of sūtras can be symbolically represented. Let 's' stand for the prakṛti or stem and 't' for the pratyaya or the affix. Let the second pratyaya, which with 'च' forms the second sūtra be called 't₁', and the second prak-

rti which occurs in the third sūtra be called 's₁'. We can represent the form of the two triads of sūtras we have just considered and of three other similar triads and their analogues thus —

I

Sūtras III : ■ 9 10

सुष आरमन् (s) क्यच् (t)	st
काम्यच् (t ₁) च [क्यच]	t ₁ (t)
उपमानाद् (s ₁) आचारे [क्यच्]	s ₁ (t)

As explained by the
Kasika and the Nyasa

II

Sūtras III : 146 147 148

ग (s) थक् (t)	st
ण्युन् (t ₁) च [ग]	(s) t ₁
इश्च (s ₁) व्याहिकालयो [ण्युन्]	s ₁ (t ₁)

III

Sūtras V. II. 102 103 104.

तपस्तहस्राभ्या (s) विनिनी (t)	st
अण् (t ₁) च [तप तहस्राभ्याम्]	(s) t ₁
मिक्षेतासर्कराभ्या (s ₁) च [अण्]	s ₁ (t ₁)

IV

Sūtras IV. II 27 28, 29

अपानप्तरपानप्चृभ्या (s) च (t) ।	st
उ (t ₁) च [अपानप्तरपानप्चृभ्याम्]	(s) t ₁
महेन्द्राद् (s ₁) पाणौ (t ₂) च [उ]	s ₁ t ₂ (t ₁)

V

Sūtras IV 11 131 132, 133.

पेशीयसभादेर्भगाद् (s) यद् (t)	st
-------------------------------	----

ख (t₁) च [वेगायेशआदेभंगाद्]

(s) t₁

पूर्वेः (s₁) कृतम् इनयौ (t₂) च [ख]

s₁ t₂ (t₁)

It will at once be seen that the first of the above five triads differs in anuvṛtti, from the other four. And it has been shown above that the anuvṛttis in the second and subsequent triads, which are of the form of st, (s) t₁ s₁ (t₁), are the natural and so the correct ones and not the anuvṛttis of the form of st, t₁ (t), s₁ (t), as the Kās'ikā and the Nyāsa on S. काम्यच् च, would have us believe

Compare also the following three sūtras from Adhyāya III, Pāda III —

नपुंसके भावे कः । 114.

Kāśika:— नपुंसकलिङ्गे भावे घातोः कः प्रत्ययो भवति। इतितम्। सहसितम्। जल्पितम् ॥

ल्युट् च । 115.

Kāśika:— नपुंसकलिङ्गे भावे घातोर्ल्युट्प्रत्ययो भवति। इत्तर्न छात्रस्य। शम्भिनम्। जल्पनम्। जयनम्। आसनम्। योगविभाग उत्तरार्थः ॥

Nyāsa — योगविभाग उत्तरार्थ इति। उत्तरत्र ल्युट् एवानुवृत्तिर्यथा स्यात्। कस्य मा भूत्।

कर्मणि च येन संस्पर्शात् शरीरसुखम् ॥ 116

Kāśika:— येन कर्मणा संस्पृश्यमानस्य कर्तुः शरीरसुखसुस्पृशते तस्मिन्कर्मण्युपपदे घातोर्नपुंसकलिङ्गे भावे ल्युट् प्रत्ययो भवति ॥

In this triad of sūtras also, it is the affix ल्युट् occurring in the second sūtra that is anuvṛtta in the third sūtra, and not 'क' occurring in the first sūtra.

If we want the 'काम्यच्' triad to conform with the similar triads quoted above, we have to rewrite it as follows:—

सुख आत्मनः (s) काम्यच् (t)

st

क्यच् (t₁) च [सुख आत्मनः]

(s) t₁

उपमानाद् (s₁) आचारे [क्यच्]

s₁ (t₁)

It may be noted that this is the order adopted by Candra in his Vyākaraṇa.

व्याप्यात् काम्यच् ॥ I. 1. 23.

st

ससंख्यादमः क्यञ्च ॥ I. 1. 24.

(s) t₁

उपमानादाचारे ॥ I. 1. 25.

st (t₁)

Now, to what is this anomaly, which could be remedied by simply re-arranging the sūtras, due? Is it due to the later insertion of the sūtra 'काम्यच्' in between the two sūtras 'सुप आत्मनः क्यच्' and 'उपमानादाचारे'?

Let us now take the three sūtras at the end of the first Pāda of the first Adhyāya and consider them.

बृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्बृद्धम् । 73

त्यदादीनि च । 74.

एह प्राचा देशे । 75.

The anuvṛtti in this triad can be shown thus —

बृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्बृद्धम् ॥ 73.

त्यदादीनि च ॥ बृद्धम् ॥ 74

एह प्राचा देशे ॥ यस्याचामादि. बृद्धम् ॥ 75.

It will at once be seen that the anuvṛtti of "यस्याचामादिः" from S. 73 into S. 75, is anomalous because it is not anuvṛtti in S. 74. It (यस्याचामादि) takes a clean leap over S. 74 and comes into S. 75 directly from S. 73. This is anomalous. It was seen to be an anomaly by Patanjali and his explanation of it we give below :—

त्यदादीनि च ॥ 74.

भाष्यम् — यस्याचामादिग्रहणमनुवर्तते उताहो न ? किं चान ? यत्तु-
वर्तते इह च प्रमज्जयेत्-त्वत्पुत्रस्य छात्राः त्वात्पुत्राः । मात्पुत्राः । इह च न स्यात्-
त्वदीयो मदीय इति ॥ अथ निवृत्तम्, " एह प्राचा देशे " यस्याचामादिग्रहणं

कतेष्वम् ॥ यत् तत्रैव वर्तते । उथ त्वात्पुत्रा मात्पुत्रा इति ? । सम्बन्धमनुवर्ति
 यते— “ वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम् ” । “ तदादीनि च ” वृद्धमज्ञानि भवन्ति,
 वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम् ॥ “ एह प्राचा देशे ” यस्याचामादिग्रहणमनुवर्तते,
 वृद्धिग्रहण निवृत्तम् । तथा— वाञ्छितकान्तारे ममुपास्थिते सार्धमुपादत्त स यदा
 निष्क्रान्तकान्तारो भवति तदा सार्धं जहानि ॥

(प्रदीप) सम्बन्धमिति । द्वितीयातमेतत् । सम्बन्धमनुरोक्त्यते न ह्याप्यनी-
 त्यर्थः ॥ अथवा सम्बन्धयत इति सम्बन्धम् । कर्माणि यन् नृपुनकेपि बाधकाभावा
 द्भवन्ति । वृद्धिग्रहणसम्बद्धमादिग्रहणमिहानुवर्तत इति नाम्नि तस्य त्यदादिभि
 सम्बन्धः ॥

It will be seen that the whole explanation is based on the
 analogy of ‘ the Man crossing the Forest and the Caravan ’
 which, it need hardly be said is not at all satisfactory.

Kaityāsa says— वृद्धिग्रहणसम्बद्धमादिग्रहणमिहानुवर्तत इति नाम्नि
 तस्य त्यदादिभि सम्बन्धः ॥ To say that a word ‘ अनुवर्तते ’ from a
 preceding into a following sūtra and yet does not get connected
 with the following sūtra, is a contradiction in terms. The
 essential characteristic of ‘ अनुवर्तते ’, is that a portion of a
 previous sūtra is inducted into a subsequent sūtra and forms
 one complete sentence with the subsequent sūtra (एकवाक्यता
 मापयते) So if there is an ‘ अनुवर्तते ’ of a word or words from
 a previous into a subsequent sūtra, that word or words must
 form an एकवाक्य with the subsequent sūtra. There is no
 other way.

On a little consideration it will be seen that all this diffi-
 culty could have been avoided simply by arranging the
 sūtras thus —

वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम् ।

एह प्राचा देशे । [यस्याचामादिस्तद्वृद्धम्]

तदादीनि च । [वृद्धम्]

This arrangement does not offend against the paribhāṣā-
 “ चातुर्वृत्तं नीतिरत्र ”, whereas the present order of the sūtras
 does offend.

Now, how can we explain the fact that an anomaly which could be remedied by such slight rearrangement of the sutras has been allowed to remain there in the 1st d. ? If the author of all the three sutras were one and the same, and wrote all the three sutras at one and the same time, then why did he not arrange the sutras in the order indicated above, which would have raised no difficulty ? Our explanation is that originally the Pāda ended with S एषादीनि च and that S एहमावां देशे was added later.

Of such anomalous anuvrttis, various explanations—explanations sometimes based on mere fanciful analogies and invented to meet the particular occasion are given. And fortunately for us, all of them occur in the Bhāṣya on S I : 3. We shall examine that portion of the Bhāṣya on S. I. 1, 3, which deals with the 'anuvrttis' and see whether Patanjali himself was satisfied with the सम्बन्धानुवर्तन explanation or with the मण्डूकप्रवृत्ति explanation which is such a favourite with the later commentators.

इको गुणवृद्धी ॥ I. 1. 3.

भाष्यम्—यदीत्यहण क्रियते, योः, मया, सः, उपमिते ज्ञेऽपि इहः प्राप्नुवन्ति ।

वार्तिकम्—संज्ञया मि शाने नियमः ।

भाष्यम्—संज्ञया ये विधीयन्ते तेषु नियमः । किं उक्तव्यमेतत् । नहि । कथमनुच्यमानं गम्यते ? गुणवृद्धिग्रहणमामध्यन् । कथं पुनरन्तरेण गुणवृद्धिग्रहणमिहो गुणवृद्धी म्याताम् ? प्रवृत्तं गुणवृद्धिग्रहणमनुवर्तते । क्व प्रवृत्तम् ? वृद्धिरादौ जदेद्गुण इति । यदि तदनुवर्तते “अदेद्गुणो वृद्धिश्च” इत्यदेव वृद्धिसंज्ञापि प्राप्नोति ॥

1. सम्बन्धमनुवर्तिष्यते—“वृद्धिरादौ च” । “अदेद्गुण.” इति वृद्धिरादौ च । ततः—“इको गुणवृद्धी” इति गुणवृद्धिग्रहणमनुवर्तते, आदौ जदेद्गुणं निवृत्तम् ॥

2 अथवा मण्डकगतयोऽधिकाराः । यथा मण्डका उत्पुन्योत्पुन्य गच्छन्ति तद्वदधिकाराः ॥

3. अथैकयोग- करिष्यते—“वृद्धिरादैजदेद्गुणः” ततः “इको गुणवृद्धी” इति । न चैकयोगेऽनुवृत्तिर्भवाति ॥

4. अथवा—“अन्यवचनाच्चकाराकरणाच्च प्रकृतापवादो विज्ञापते, यथोत्सर्गेण प्रसक्तस्यापवादो बाधको भवति” ॥

अन्यस्याः संज्ञाया वचनाच्चकारस्य चाधुरूपणार्थस्याकरणात् प्रकृताया वृद्धिमंज्ञाया गुणमंज्ञा बाधिका भविष्यति । यथोत्सर्गेण प्रसक्तस्यापवादो बाधको भवति ॥

■ अथवा वक्ष्येत्येतद्—“अनुवर्तन्ते च नाम विषयः । न चाधुरर्तनादेव भवन्ति । किं तद्धि ? । यस्माद् भवन्ति ” इति ॥

■ अथवा—उभयं निवृत्तम् । तदपेक्षिष्यामहे ॥

Patanjali here gives six explanations of the anomalous anuvṛtti of “वृद्धिः” from the first to the third sūtra. From this we can say that Patanjali himself was not satisfied with the सम्बन्धाधुवर्तन and the मण्डकच्छति explanations. The first explanation which Patanjali offers us is : सम्बन्धमधुवर्तिष्यते. Patanjali not being satisfied with this gives a second explanation—मण्डकगतयोऽधिकाराः. This explanation also not satisfying him he offers us four others. In the Bhāṣya itself it is said that a second explanation is given, where the first is not in the opinion of the author satisfactory.† And so says Kumārila also—

सर्वव्याख्याविकल्पानां द्वयमेव प्रयोजनम् ।

पूर्वत्रापरितोषो वा विषयव्याप्तिरेव वा ॥ †

And one of the Mīmāṃsā rules of interpretation lays it down that whenever several explanations are given by the

† अपारितुष्यन् स्वल्पापि भवाननेन परिहारेण ‘अनावृत्तिलिङ्गेन वा’ इत्याह ।
Bhāṣya on S. I 1 1.

‡ Jaimini's Mīmāṃsā Sūtras, Anand, Edition Vol. I p 186.

author in successive clauses, it is only the last that is to be taken as the one approved of by the author * And as Patanjali offers us four explanations after the Mandūkapyuti explanation, and five after the Sambandhānuvartana explanation it is clear that he was satisfied with neither the Sambandhānuvartana nor the Mandūkapyuti explanations he resorted to them only as an “अगतिश्च गति”, a counsel of despair. The Laghus’abdendus’ekhara on ४ दिशमोऽमाम् I iv 110 says — सत्यामुपपत्तौ मण्डूकानुवर्तयुक्तत्वात् ।

II

The Particle च — We find in the Paribhāṣendus’ekhara the Paribhāṣā— चातुष्टयं नोत्तरम्. This is not one of the Paribhāṣās, expressly laid down in the Aṣṭd. but in the words of the Paribhāṣendus’ekhara, “जमुन्यनुवर्तमाने ‘अयदेऽप्याभिरेता’ (III. iv ११) इति सूत्रे पुनर्जमुन्यनुवर्तमाना आपदम् ।”

Under ‘च’, Apte in his Dictionary says A particle expressing I. Copulation used to join words or assertions together. In this sense it is used with each of the words or assertions which it joins together, or it is used after the last of the words or assertions so joined. “Now the use of ‘च’ with each of the assertions which it joins together is unthinkable in the Aṣṭd, because its use with only the last assertion serves the purpose as well, and it is well known that अयमाश्रयस्तेन पुनोऽस्य मन्थने वैपाकरणा । So if ‘च’ is at all used in the sūtras it must be with the last of the assertions and we expect the Adhikāra to end with the assertion. So “चातुष्टयं नोत्तरम्” lays down not so much an artificial Paribhāṣa of the Vyākaranasastra as a rule which governs the structure of a Sanskrit sentence. Let us consider the following sūtras from the first Pada of the first Adhyaya

* Vide Maine’s Hindu Law Eighth Edition p. 36

ईदृदेद् द्विवचनं प्रगृह्यम् ॥ ११ ॥
 अदसो मात् ॥ १२ ॥ ईदृदेत्, प्रगृह्यम् ॥
 शे ॥ १३ ॥ प्रगृह्यम् ॥
 निपात एकाजनाद् ॥ १४ ॥ प्रगृह्यम् ॥
 ओत् ॥ १५ ॥ प्रगृह्यम् ॥
 सम्बुद्धौ शाकल्पस्येतावनार्थे ॥ १६ ॥ ओत्, प्रगृह्यम् ॥
 ज्व ऊँ ॥ १७, १८ ॥ प्रगृह्यम् ॥
 ईदृत्तौ च सप्तम्यर्थे ॥ १९ ॥ प्रगृह्यम् ॥
 दापा एदाप् ॥ २० ॥

It will be seen that sūtras 11 to 19 are assertions about 'प्रगृह्यम्' and that 'च' is used with the last assertion. Thus we see that the 'प्रगृह्य' adbhikāra ends with S. 19, into which the word 'प्रगृह्यम्' is inducted from S. 11 by a 'च', the word 'प्रगृह्यम्' passing through all the sūtras between S. 11 and S. 19 and being connected with each of them on its way from S. 11 to S. 19. With S. 19 the Pragrhyādbhikāra ends, and S. 20 speaks about the 'षु' verbs. The word 'प्रगृह्यम्' which is drawn into S. 19 from S. 11, by the word च, does not further proceed to S. 20. Thus we arrive at the rule: चातुर्थं नोत्तरम्. If any sūtra about 'प्रगृह्यम्' had come after S. 19, that sūtra would have to be regarded as perhaps a later addition.

So whenever a 'च' occurs in a sūtra we expect the sūtra to be the last of the assertions about something, i. e. we expect the sūtra to stand at the end of an adbhikāra, or in other words, we expect the anuvṛtti of some word to end with it.

This is supported by the Bhāṣya also. Patañjali on S. I : 48 (पठो न्यानेयोगा) says—

अधिकारो नाम त्रिप्रकारः ॥ कश्चिदेकदेशस्थः सर्वं साम्प्रतमभिज्वलयति, यथा प्रतीप. सप्रज्वलितः सर्वं वेदमाभिज्वलयति ॥ अपरोऽधिकारो यथा रज्ज्वा

अयमा वा बद्ध काष्ठमनुकृत्य तद्वदनुकृत्य चकारण ॥ अपराधिकार प्रतियोग
तस्य निर्देशार्थं इति योग योग उपतिष्ठते ॥

Of these three kinds of Adhikaras spoken of by Patanjali we are here concerned only with the second अपराधिकार यथा रज्ज्वा भवमा वा बद्ध काष्ठमनुकृत्य तद्वदनुकृत्य चकारण । Now if an अधिकृत word (अधिकार) is drawn towards a sūtra by a 'च', just like a piece of wood tied to a piece of rope or iron (chain) and drawn towards oneself then it is clear that the word so drawn by a 'च' into a sūtra should not go into the next sūtra because the function of च is only to attract the अधिकृत word to the sūtra in which it (च) occurs, and not to push it on into the next sūtra चानुकृत नास्तरत्र

But there occur in the Aśtd many cases where the rule 'चानुकृत नास्तरत्र' is not observed. This seems to have greatly puzzled Patanjali so much so that in his Bhaṣya on छुटि च रूप (I ॥ 93) he proposes to strike off all the anuvṛtṭya rtha 'च' s from the Aśtd

छुटि च रूप ॥ I ॥ 93

भाष्यम् — विमर्शं चकार । म्यसमाहित्येतदनुकृत्यते । यदि तर्हि नान्तरण चकारमनुकृतिर्भवति तुद्व्या ह्यह इत्यत्रापि चकार कर्तव्य । विभाषत्यनुकर्षणार्थं । अवशानीमन्तरणानि चकारमनुकृतिर्भवति, इहापि नार्थचकारेण । सर्वे चकारा प्रत्याख्यान्यते । *

उदीयत — सर्वे चकारा इति । अनुकृतिवत्त्वा इत्यर्थं ॥

* But compare per contra —

छुटि च रूप ॥ I ॥ 93

Ṭasika — वृत्तान्तित्वादेरस्यसमाविर्गन्त्य सिद्ध । छुटि विधीयते । चकार स्तर्हि म्यसमाहित्यनुकृतिवत्त्वात् न वक्तव्य । एव तर्हि इयं प्राप्ति पूर्वा प्राप्तिं बाधेत । तस्माच्चकार म्यसमाहित्यनुकृतिवत्त्वात् क्रियत । छुटि च म्यसमाहित्ये कृप परमैषद वा भवति ॥

It need hardly be said that Patanjali's proposal to drop all the anuvṛtṭyārtha 'च's from the Aṣṭa. is unscientific. अयं मात्रालक्षणेन पुत्रोत्सर्वं मन्यन्ते वैयाकरणाः, and it is inconceivable that there should be so many useless 'च's in the Aṣṭa. As Patanjali has himself observed in his Bhāṣya on S. I. 1, "प्रमाणभूत आचार्यो दर्भपवित्रपाणि शुचापवकाशे प्रादुर्मुख उपविश्य महता प्रयत्नेन सत्राणि प्रणयति स्म । तत्राशक्यं वर्णेनाप्यनर्थेन भवितुम् ॥". So we ought not to drop the 'च's but try to understand them.

Let us consider the following three sūtras at the end of the first Pāda of the first Adhyāya

वृद्धिर्यस्याच्चा मादिस्तद्बृद्धम् ॥ ७३ ॥

त्यदादीनि च ॥ ७४ ॥ वृद्धम् ॥

एह प्राचा देशे ॥ ७५ ॥ वृद्धम् ॥

It will be seen that the word वृद्धम्, though drawn into S. 74 from S. 73 by a 'च', yet proceeds to S. 75. Here is an exception to the rule—चातुर्वृद्धं नौत्तरत्वं Patanjali would have the 'च' dropped from S. 74. But it is not right to delete the 'च' we have to understand it. We think that originally there were only two sūtras about 'वृद्ध', viz. S. वृद्धिर्यस्याच्चा मादिस्तद्बृद्धम् and S. त्यदादीनि च. The 'च' in S. 'त्यदादीनि च' indicates this. S. 'एह प्राचा देशे' is a later addition. Are all the infractions of the Paribhāṣā 'चातुर्वृद्धं नौत्तरत्वं' due to later additions of sūtras?

III

The Yogasūbhaga :— One who takes up a printed copy of the Aṣṭa or even a manuscript two or three hundred years old, will find that every sūtra is separately written and in the printed texts numbered. But one would be committing a serious mistake if one were to suppose that Panini originally gave us his sūtras in this way. For instance, in any printed copy of the Aṣṭa, we find sūtras 'एदिरादैच्' and 'अदश्चुण'

printed and numbered separately. But Panini himself did not give us his sūtras thus separated one from the other, but he gave us them in the *संहितापाठ*, thus :—*यदिसादेनदेहगुण इवो-
गुणवृद्धी* etc.* But he taught his pupils how to separate them from each other, and in most cases it is not very difficult to do so. Every sūtra or yoga is a sentence—elliptical it may be—and can easily be separated from the rest. This breaking up of the *संहितापाठ* into its component sūtras is called *योगविभाग*. *योगानां सूत्राणां विभागो विभजनम्*†. This kind of *Yogavibhāga* should be distinguished from the one which is sometimes advocated by Kātyāyana and Patanjali, where one single sūtra (योग) is split up into more than one sūtras, to cover facts of language, which most probably escaped the notice of Panini and for which he did not intend to provide †

There is yet a third kind of *योगविभाग*, where the Aśtā has two consecutive sūtras mostly connected with a 'च', when the two sūtras could have been combined into one single sūtra. We often read in the *Kāś'ikā* — “*विमर्षो योगविभागः ? योगविभाग उत्तरार्धे ।*” “*विमर्षो योगविभागः ? यथासंन्यनिवारणार्थो योगविभागः ॥*” The question is: Why has the Aśtā two sūtras instead of one? why is there *योगविभाग*? could not the two

* Cf. “यदि भमंशा, ‘यदिसादेनदेहगुण.’ इति जइत्वमपि न प्राप्नोति” ।

Bhasya on S I 1. 1.

Also Bhasya on S स्थानेन्तरतम. I. 1. 49.

यथा पुनरियमन्तरतमनिर्गुति, सा चि प्रवृत्तिनो भवति—स्थानिन्यन्तरतमे पठ्यति । आहोस्विदादेनत—स्थाने प्राप्यमाणानामन्तरतम आदेशो भवतीति॥ कुत. पुनरिय विचारणा ? । उभयथा हि तुल्या सहिता “स्थानेन्तरतम वरणपरः” इति ॥

वदोत — अनेन संहितापाठ ण्य पुर्य स्थित इत्युचम् ।

† Cf. Bhasya on S. उच ऊँ (I 1. 17) and on S ‘प्रादय उपसर्गो.’ (I. iv. 54) and the note by the दाचिमथ on them in N. S. Edition

sūtras be with advantage combined into one single sūtra? The question is almost always answered thus -- 'योगविभाग उत्तरार्थे ।' 'यथासंख्यनिवारणार्थो योगविभागः' ॥. It is this third kind of Yogavibhāga, that we are here concerned with. Let us consider the following sūtras—

द्वित्रिपूर्वाभिप्पान् ॥ V. ३०. ॥ विभाषा सुक् ॥

विस्तास ॥ ३१. ॥ विभाषा सुक् ॥

विशतिवात्य ॥ ३२ ॥

Why is there योगविभाग between sūtras 30 and 31? Could not the two sūtras have been combined into a single sūtra—द्वित्रिपूर्वाभ्यां निप्पविस्ताभ्याम्, or better still द्वित्रिपूर्वाभिप्प-विस्तान् !? The answer is in the negative. If the two sūtras were to be combined into one, then the paribhāṣā "यथासंख्य-मनुदैनः समानाम्" would have applied and the meaning of the sūtra would have been—There is optional (vibhāṣā) सुक्, of the आर्हीय affix added to 'निप्प' preceded by 'द्वि', and to 'विप्प' preceded by 'त्रि'. But the author of the sūtra wanted that there should be optional सुक् of the आर्हीय affix even when it was added to 'निप्प' preceded by 'त्रि' and to 'विप्प' preceded by 'द्वि'. In order to accomplish this he had to evade the यथासंख्य paribhāṣā and this he could do only by योगविभाग, by writing two sūtras—द्वित्रिपूर्वाभिप्पान् and विस्तास .

Let us take another group of sūtras —

गायकन् ॥ III : 146

Kaṅka—गायन चकन् प्रत्ययो भवति गित्तिनि चर्करि । गायक । गायिका ।

पुद् च ॥ 147.

Farika —चकारेण ग इत्यनुवृत्त्यने । गायनेर्गुद् प्रत्ययो भवति गित्तिनि चर्करि । गायन , गायनी । योगविभाग उत्तरार्थे ॥

Nyāsa — योगविभाग उत्तरार्धे इति । उत्तरं चकारेण षुट एवानुवृत्तिर्ध्या-
म्यात् । ध्यानो मा भूदिति । सो षुट्पञ्चनारित्येकयोगे थकत्रप्यनुवृत्त्येत ।

इथ श्रीहिरण्योः ॥ 148.

Kaśika — चकारेण षुट्पञ्चनारित्ये । ज्ञानेतिर्हीनेष ध्यानोऽयं प्रत्ययी
भरति ।

Here the author of the sutras could have combined S. 146 and 147, into one sutra, गो षुट्पञ्चनो But he has not done so because he wanted that षुट् only, and not पञ्चन् also, should be inducted into S. 148. The point is made quite clear in the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa* on S. 147.

Let us take another example from Pāda iii, Adhyāya 1V.

अविशक्तम्युष्यवुशवाभ्यानिनिष्पुनर्वसुहृन्नाविशावापाशवहृताक्षुर् ॥ 34

न्यानान्तगोमाश्वरसाश्च ॥ 35.

Why is there the *Yogavibhāga* here? Here there is no possibility of the application of the *Yathāzankhya paribhāṣā*, nor is the anuvṛtti of 'न्यानांतगोमाश्वरसाश्च' required in the next sutra. The *Kāśikā* does not give any reason for the *Yogavibhāga*, nor does the *Nyāsa*. The *Kaumudī* is silent on the point. The author of the sutras here seems to have resorted to the *Yogavibhāga*, because it would be rather awkward to speak of such bright celestial objects as the *S'raviṣṭhā* etc. and of such earthly things as an ass or mule shed, in the same breath, though elsewhere he does not scruple to speak of अन् and मयवेन्, in one and the same sutra. Another reason for the *Yogavibhāga* might be that if the two sutras were combined into one, then the resulting sutra would be too cumbersome. But compare S. VII, iv, 65 दापतिदधतिदधंपिबोभून् तेनित्तुडप्योऽपनीपजमंमलिप्यदकत्रित्तनित्तदृष्टिभद्विभनोदविपुततरि-
अन मरीमुपतंवरीट्टजन्मसृज्याऽऽगनीगन्तीनिच ॥

Let us consider another case of *Yogavibhāga*

4 प्रजोरिनिः ॥ III. ॥. 156.

Kaśika — प्रपूर्वाञ्जतेः तच्छीलादिषु कर्तृषु इनिः प्रत्ययो भवति । प्रजवी प्रजविने ॥

सिद्धिर्विभ्रौषमाव्यभाष्यमरिभूपमस्य ॥ 157.

Kaśika :— सिप्रभृतिभ्यो घातुभ्यः इनिः प्रत्ययो भवति तच्छीलादिषु कर्तृषु ॥

Here at last we have a case where no reason has been ascribed for the *Yogavibhāga*. One may be tempted to say that S. 156 deals with an *upaersta* root (प्र जु), whereas S. 157 deals with *anupaersta* roots, and so there is *Yogavibhāga*. But it cannot be so said : There are *upaersta* roots (विभी अभ्यस, परिभू, प्रम्) in S. 157 also. There is absolutely no question here of the *Yathāsaṅkhyā* rule or of 'उत्तरघातुत्ति'. So no reason can be assigned to the *Yogavibhāga* between sutras 156 and 157. Then what is the *Yogavibhāga* due to? How to explain the *Yogavibhāga*? We think that originally the *Sūtrakāra* wrote only S. 156 (प्रजोरिनिः) and that S. 157, is an addition by a later *Ācārya*. Thus the author of S. 156 is not the same as that of S. 157. Sutra 156 is by an earlier *Ācārya*, and sutra 157 by a later.

It may be said in the words of Patanjali, "पुरस्तादिमाचार्येण दृष्टं 'प्रजोरिनिः' इति । तत्पठितम् न तत् उत्तरघातमिदं दृष्टं 'सिद्धौ' इति । तदपि पठितम् ॥ न चेदानीमाचार्याः मृषाणि कृत्वा निरतंरन्ति " 4 and that Ss. 156 and 157 are written by the same *Ācārya* but at different times. But even so, it is admitted that when the *Ācārya* wrote "प्रम् takes the affix इनि", he was

4 Cf. पुरस्तादिमाचार्येण दृष्टम् । 'भवेच्च तदित' इति । तत्पठितम् । तत् उत्तरघातमिदं दृष्टम् । 'प्रोलादप्य तदिनाः' इति । तदपि पठितम् । न चेदानीमाचार्याः मृषाणि कृत्वा निरतंरन्ति । Pāras'ā.

not conscious of the fact that roots *नि* etc. also take the same affix (नत उत्तरखण्डमिदं दृष्टम्). So he must have added S 157 after a considerable lapse of time, after going through the whole of the then available literature to see what other roots than *प्रनु* take the affix *इनि*. This is possible, but highly improbable. It must be remembered that "प्रमाणभूत आचार्यो दर्शयति विप्रपाणिः सुखावरहाणि प्रादुश्वस्य उपविश्य महता प्रयत्नेन सूत्राणि प्रणयति स्म." Therefore, it is not likely that he wrote S. प्रज्ञोतिनि, without thoroughly searching the whole literature available to him for roots taking the affix *इनि*, the more so, because he knew, that once he composed a sūtra he could not go back upon it (न श्वेदानीमाचार्याः सूत्राणि दृष्ट्वा निवर्तयन्ति). And if he could not find in his first thorough search of literature, that some roots other than *प्रनु* also take the affix *इनि*, it is most unlikely that a second search should reveal them to him. It is more reasonable to suppose that a subsequent Ācārya—to whom literature that was not available to the prior Ācārya who wrote S 156, was available—composed S 157 and inserted it in the proper place.

Conclusion.—The Mandūkyaṭī, the चातुर्वृत्त्योत्तरवाटुवृत्त, and the useless Yogavibhāga, indicate sūtras that have been added later to an already existing book of sūtras.

It is to be noted that the word उपदेश in S. I. m. 2. must be taken to include the Ganapātha. Otherwise, it would be difficult to give the name of इत् to the consonants at the end of many of the prātīpadikas in the Ganapātha. Thus 'इ' in 'नदइ' 'नोरइ' etc., occurring in the Ganapātha cannot be called an इत्, unless it be held that S. इत्त्यम् applies to the Ganapātha. And S. इत्त्यम् applies only to the उपदेश.

Now, this fact that by the word उपदेश, which is anuvṛta from H उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इत्, into S. इत्त्यम्,—Panini, the author of the Aṣṭa, refers to the Ganapātha is very significant. It shows that Panini received the whole of the Ganapātha from his predecessors as उपदेश; because, in the words of Nagoji Bhatta, 'उपदेश इत्युक्ते गुरुकर्तृवतायाः स्वरसनः प्रतीतिः' ।*

Let us consider the following two sūtras.

गवादिभ्यो यत् । V. 1. 2

Kaśika.—प्राक् कीनादित्येव । इत्यन्तितातिपदिवाद्, गवादिभ्यश्च यत् प्रत्ययो भवति ॥.... गो । इविम् वाहिम् ।.... (ग. म्) नाभि नभे च । (ग. म्) शूनः सम्प्रसारणं वा च दीर्घं तन्मनिषीमेन चान्तादात्तत्वम् ॥ (ग. म्) ऊपमोऽनद् च ॥ इप..... विप ॥ गवादिः ॥

It will be seen that the गवादिगण contains three Ganasūtras.

कम्बराश्च संज्ञायाम् ॥ V. 1. 3.

Kaśika—कम्बराश्च प्राक् कीनादित्येव यत्प्रत्ययो भवति उभ्यापवादः संज्ञाया विषये ॥

Now a very important question is raised by the Nyāsa, and answered thus—

अथ गवादिभ्यश्च कम्बराश्च संज्ञायामिति कम्प्याय पठति ? । तत्र पाठे न वधिद् गुरुदाघवहृनो विशेष इति यत्किञ्चिदेतदिति ॥

* Uddyota, on Paśyasa on Vartika—वृत्तिसमवायार्थं उपदेशः ।

We submit there is certainly some 'विशेष'. If the sūtra कंवल्लोच संज्ञायाम्, had been included in the Gaṇapāṭha, then, the Sūtrapāṭha would have been shorter by twelve whole mātrās, moreover, there is no reason why "नाभि नभं च" "गुणः संप्रसारणं वा च दीर्घत्वं तत्सन्धियोगेन चान्तोदात्तत्वम्" and "ऊयसोऽनङ् च" should be put in the Gaṇapāṭha as Gaṇasūtras, and why "कम्बल्लोच संज्ञायाम्" which also could have been included in the गवादिगण as a Gaṇasūtra, should be put in the Aśtd. as a sūtra of the Sūtrapāṭha. This is unmethodical. We think the true explanation is that Panini got both S. V. 1. 2. and the गवादिगण attached to it from his Ācāryas as उपदेश and so being unwilling to tamper with the text of the गवादिगण, put S. "कम्बल्लोच संज्ञायाम्" in the Sūtrapāṭha.

In this connection, the Bhāṣya on S. I. 1. 34. is very important and let us turn to it

पूर्वपदान्तरदक्षिणोत्तरापराधराणि व्यवस्थायामसंज्ञायाम् ॥ I. 1. 34.

वार्तिकम्.—अवरादीनां च पुनः सूत्रपाठे ग्रहणमनर्थक्यं गणे पठितत्वात् ॥

From this Vārtika it is clear that Kātyāyana held that the Gaṇapāṭha preceded the Sūtrapāṭha or Aśtādhyāyī in point of time.

(गणपाठसूत्रपाठयोः कालनिर्णयाधिकरणम्)

भाष्यम्.—अवरादीनां च पुनः सूत्रपाठे ग्रहणमनर्थकम् । किं कारणम् । गणे पठितत्वात् । गणे घेतानि पठ्यन्ते ॥ कथं पुनर्ज्ञायते—स पूर्वः पाठः, अयं पुनः पाठ इति ? । तानि हि पूर्वोद्दिष्टानि, इमान्यवरादीनि ॥

प्रदीपः.—तेन पूर्वं गणपाठः पश्चात्सूत्रपाठ इत्यर्थः ॥

भाष्यम्.—इमान्यपि पूर्वोद्दिष्टानि ॥ एवं तर्हि आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति—'स पूर्वः पाठः, अयं पुनः पाठः' इति । यदयं "पूर्वोद्दिष्टो नवभ्यो वा" इति नवग्रहणं करोति । नवैव हि पूर्वोद्दिष्टानि ॥

प्रदीपः.—नवग्रहणमिति । तत्र हि नवग्रहणं त्वदादीनां निरासार्थं कियते । यदि च नियतसंनिवेशो गणपाठः पूर्वः, ततोऽधिकव्यवच्छेदस्य नवग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् ॥

उद्योत — नवेवेति भाष्ये । अष्टाध्याय्या पूर्वस्थादिमूत्रपठितानि इत्यर्थे । अष्टाध्याय्या पूर्वसालत्वे पूर्वार्थेति मूत्रे अष्टाध्यायीमूत्रपठितानामेव तेषां ग्रहणं स्यादिति भावः ॥

In this passage of the Bhāṣya, Patañjali has established that the Gānāpātha preceded the Aṣṭa in point of time

(मूत्रप्रयोजनाधिकरणम्)

1 भाष्यम् — इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम्—व्यवस्थायामसहायामिति वक्ष्यामीति । एतदपि नाम्नि प्रयोजनम् । एवमिति अन्यैस्तानि गणे पठ्यन्ते ॥

2 इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम्—आदिपर्वुदासेन पर्वुदासो मा भूदिति ॥

प्रदीप — आदिपर्वुदासेनेति । न्युदासीनि पठित्वा गणे वैश्विदुर्गं दीनि पठितानि । तत्राद्यादिभ्य इति तत्सिद्धार्थेना प्रतिषेधं प्राप्नोति । तत्र पुनः सर्वनामसहा तत्सिद्धादिविधानार्थं विधीयते । तेन आदिपर्वुदासो बाध्यते ॥

भाष्यम् — एतदपि नाम्नि प्रयोजनम् । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्होषयति—नैषा आदि पर्वुदासेन पर्वुदासो भवतीति । यद्यपि पूर्वत्रासिद्धमिति निपातनं करोति । वार्तिककारश्च पठति “जडभावादिषु चेदुत्तराभावात्पञ्चमस्य” इति ॥

3 इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनं जामि विभाषा वक्ष्यामीति ॥

Let us consider the second of the above three Prayojanas. The सर्वार्थिगण, as we have it at present reads—

सर्वं विश्वं उभय इतर इतम अन्य अन्यतर इतर त्वत् त्व नेम सम निम । पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तरापराधराणि व्यवस्थायामसहायाम् । स्वमहातिथनाख्यायाम् । अन्तरं बहिर्योगापसव्यानयो । त्वद् तद् यद् एतद् इदम् अदम् एव हि युष्मद् अस्मद् भवतु किम् ॥ सर्वोदि ॥

But Patañjali when he says— “इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम्—आदिपर्वुदासेन पर्वुदासो मा भूदिति”, refers to a second version of the सर्वार्थिगण which read—

सर्वं विश्वं उभय इतर इतम अन्य अन्यतर इतर त्वत् त्व नेम सम निम । त्वद् तद् यद् एतद् इदम् अदम् एव हि युष्मद् अस्मद् भवतु किम् । पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तरापराधराणि व्यवस्थायामसहायाम् । स्वमहातिथनाख्यायाम् । अन्तरं बहिर्योगापसव्यानयो ॥ सर्वोदि ॥ (Viḍe प्रदीप)

It will be seen that the Dvyādis, that is, the word द्वि and the words coming after it in the Gana, according to the first version, are:— द्वि युष्मद् अस्मद् भवतु and विम्; whereas, according to the second version, they are— द्वि युष्मद् अस्मद् भवतु किम् । पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तरापराधराणि व्यग्रस्थायामसंज्ञायाम् । स्वमज्ञातिधनाख्यायाम् । and अन्तरं बहिर्योगोपसंख्यानयोः ।

Now let us turn to S. V. iii. 3.

किंस्वनामबहुभ्योऽङ्गुथादिभ्यः ॥ *

Naṣṭa.— प्राग्दिश इत्येव । किम् सर्वनामो बहुसंज्ञाश्च प्राग्दिशः प्रत्यया वेदितव्याः । सर्वनामस्वात्प्राप्ते ग्रहणे व्यादिपयुंदासः क्रियते । ...अद्यादिभ्य इति किम् ? । द्वाभ्याम्, द्वयोः ॥

Thus, a प्राग्दिशोय termination is not to be added to a 'Dvyādi' word (अङ्गुथादिभ्यः). Now, as we have seen, the words पूर्व पर अवर दक्षिण उत्तर अपर अग्र (व्यग्रस्थायामसंज्ञायाम्) म्व (अज्ञातिधनाख्यायाम्) and अन्तर (बहिर्योगोपसंख्यानयोः), are Dvyādis' according to the second version of the सर्वादिवर्ण. Then, how can we get forms like पूर्वत्र and उत्तरत्र ? 'त्र' is a प्राग्दिशोय termination; and the words पूर्व and उत्तर are 'Dvyādis' according to the second version of the सर्वादिवर्ण; therefore, अङ्गुथादिभ्यः इति प्रतिषेधः प्राप्नोति । To remove this 'द्व्यादिपयुंदासेन पयुंदासः' difficulty caused by the second version of the सर्वादिवर्ण—so II is urged—is the purpose (प्रयोजन) of S. I. 1. 34. (पूर्वपरावर०): इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनं—व्यादिपयुंदासेन पयुंदासो मा भूदिति । *

Though this 'Prayojana' or purpose for the sūtra (I. 1. 34) is not accepted by Patanjali, who gets over the द्व्यादिपयुंदास difficulty by means of the आचार्यप्रवृत्ति, —yet, the very fact that it is advanced at all, is very significant. It clearly shows that the author of the Astā is not the author of the सर्वादिवर्ण, and that it existed already before his time in two versions. If the

* Vide the *प्रदीप* quoted above on this point

author of the *Astā.* were also the author of the *सर्वादिगण*, then, he would have given us only that version of the *सर्वादिगण*, which does not give rise to the *म्यादिश्रुतम्* difficulty.

If the *सर्वादिगण* pre-existed Panini, the author of the *Astā.*, then the *sūtras* 1. पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तराक्षराक्षराणि ध्वन्यायाममंज्ञायाम्, 2. स्वमज्ञानिपताग्यायाम्, and 3. भन्तरं बहियोगोदमन्योनयोः, which occur in the *सर्वादिगण* as *गणमूत्रा*, must also be pre-Paninian. Panini borrowed the three *sūtras* from the *Gaṇapāṭha* and incorporated them in his *Astā.*, as *SS. I. 1. 34, 35, and 36.*

We here witness a peculiar phenomenon. First, we have the *sūtra* *सर्वादीनि सर्वनामानि*. To it is attached the *म्यादिगण*. The *gṇa* contains the *Gaṇapāṭhas*—“पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तराक्षराक्षराणि ध्वन्यायाममंज्ञायाम्” “स्वमज्ञानिपताग्यायाम्” and “भन्तरं बहियोगोदमन्योनयोः”. These are taken into the *Sūtrapāṭha* or the *Astā.* Thus it is clear that some *Gaṇapāṭhas* were sometimes turned into the *Astā. sūtras*. Thus ‘वपमोऽनद च’ is a *Gaṇapāṭha* occurring in the *म्यादिगण*, attached to *S. V. 1. 2*, but it also appears in the *Astā.* as *S. V. 17. 13*. There are cases where *Gaṇapāṭhas* have been turned into the *Astā. sūtras*. In some cases *पातुगणमूत्रा* have served as the basis of some *Astā. sūtras*. Commenting on *S. III. 1. 21* the *Nyūsa* says:—*प्रातिपदिकाद् पारायें बह्वमिष्टवच (पा. मू.) इत्यनेन शुभ्रतद्विभ्यः सिद्धो निष् । अयं च तस्यैव प्रथमः ।* And again, four *sūtras* later, on *S. 25*, the *Nyūsa* says — *पुलादिभ्योऽप्येषामिष्ट वदणं प्रथमार्थम् । प्रातिपदिकाद् पारायें इति सिद्धवान् ।* Here we see a *पातुगणमूत्र* forming the basis of the *Astā. sūtras* *III. 1. 21 and 25*.

Thus we have seen that Panini, the author of the *Astā.*, received both the *Gaṇapāṭha* and the *Dhātupāṭha* (see Chapter II) from his *Ācāryas* as *वदीयम्*.

The *Gaṇapāṭha* seems, however, not to have been held so unchangeable and sacred as the *पातुगण*. Successive *Ācāryas*

seem to have made changes in the Ganapāṭha. This is due mainly to the fundamental difference between the words contained in the धातुपाठ and those contained in the गणपाठ. The गणपाठ consists of nouns—and many of these are names of persons, families, tribes, countries and towns and villages. All these are liable to fluctuations of fortune. Thus the tribes that were extant at the time of the predecessors of Panini might not be in existence at the time of Panini—and tribes might have changed their places of habitat migrating from one country to another, sometimes leaving the stamp of their names on the countries which they left for good. This is evidenced by the *sūtra* योगप्रमाणे च तदभावेऽदर्शनं स्यात्. New towns, tribes, families and personalities arose and threw into back ground or even oblivion the older ones. This seems to have made changes in the Ganapāṭha from time to time imperative. But such was not the case with the Dhātupāṭha. The Dhātus being primal elements of the language, are not liable to change. Particular forms given by a root may become obsolete, but the root itself can never become obsolete. The same old root appears under new forms. This we think is the reason why the Dhātupāṭha has been preserved in its pristine purity and why the *ganas* of nouns, given by the Kāśīka and the Kaumudī sometimes differ so widely.

CHAPTER VIII

THE RIDDLE OF THE PĀNINĪYA

I. The Dhātupāṭha does not seem to be by the author of the Aṣṭā, but seems to be the work of a predecessor of Pāṇini. But nevertheless the arrangement of roots, and the system of इत्, in the Dhātupāṭha clearly shows that the author of the Dhātupāṭha knew very many sūtras now found in the Aṣṭā, and so arranged the roots in the Dhātupāṭha as to serve the purposes of those sūtras. (Chapter II)

II Similar is the case with the Ganapāṭha (Chap VII)

III. The Aṣṭādhyāyī.

(1) The Māndūkyaśloka, the चातुर्वृत्त्योपरत्रावृत्ति, and the purposeless Yogavibhāga indicate sūtras that have been added later to an already existing book of sūtras. (Chapter VI)

(2) a In the Aṣṭā there is not a single important Paribhāṣā that has not important exceptions (p 57).

b Some important Paribhāṣās that were expressly laid down in the works of Pāṇini's predecessors and not met with in the Aṣṭā, are nevertheless applicable to the Aṣṭā, because they are, in the words of the Paribhāṣendusekhaṇa—पाणिनीयनन्त्रे प्राप्यन्यायमिदानीम् I.* (p. 33)

(3) The Aṣṭā is not uniform in its use of Sanskrit or technical terms (Chapter IV)

* Nāgajī Bhaṭṭa begins his Paribhāṣendusekhaṇa with the words प्राचीनैरप्यकरणनन्त्रे पाणिनिजानि, अत्र पाणिनीयनन्त्रे प्राप्यन्यायमिदानीम् प्राप्यमानैश्च योऽपनिबृहदनि यानि परिभाषाव्यापि तानि व्याख्यायन्ते ।

- (4) There are to be found in the Aṣṭād some metrical sūtras (Chapter V)
- (5) The Aṣṭād. is very irregular in its use of cases (Ibid)
- (6) The Nipātana sūtras intervene abruptly between rules expressed in the regular analytic form (Ibid)
- (7) In the Aṣṭād the Vedic literature is referred to promiscuously with the words छन्दम् मन्त्र and निगम, and the notion of option is expressed indiscriminately with the words वा, उभयथा, अन्यतरस्याम्, विभाषा and बहुलम्. For 'substance' four words are used द्रव्य, तत्त्व, अधिकरण and वस्तु (p. 66)

If we can formulate a hypothesis which will rationally explain all the above facts connected with the Paninian system we can be sure of having arrived at the right solution of the riddle of the Paninīya

“It will be long before we understand, if indeed we ever come to do so, what and how much of it is Panini's own, in addition to the work of his grammatical predecessors ”

Whitney, *The Veda in Panini*, p. 1.

CHAPTER IX

THE STRUCTURE OF THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ.

I

Panini and his Predecessors.*—Panini was not the first grammarian of India. Many great grammarians like S'ākātāyana had come and gone before him. Panini was not even the founder of the school which goes by his name. He refers to his 'आचार्यः' and this shows that Panini was not the founder of a new school, but that he was one of a series of आचार्यः of a school that already existed in his time. And so Panini must have carried on the work that was done by the predecessors in his school and he must have carried it on mainly on the lines laid down by them. At the time of Panini there were many schools of grammar in India. The names of some of the great figures belonging to schools other than the one to which Panini belonged, are preserved for us in the Aṣṭ. They are Āpīs'alī, Kās'yapa, Gārgya Gūlava, Cūkravarmāṇa, Bhāradvāja Sākatāyana, Sākalya, Senaka and Sphoṭāyana. This long array of names of the predecessors of Panini, is sufficient to show that the science of grammar had made much progress before Panini—nay, the theory of Sphoṭa, which is peculiar to grammarians seems, to judge from the name Sphoṭāyana to have been fully formulated long before Panini. In Panini's time we are told by Patanjali,*

* किं पुनराहति पदार्थं, आहोस्विद् द्रव्यम्? उभयमिदं । कथं ज्ञायते? । उभयथा ह्यचक्षेण सूत्राणि वदितानि । आहति पदार्थं मत्वा जात्याख्यायामेव स्मिन् बहुवचनमन्यतरस्यामिस्तुच्यते । द्रव्यं पदार्थं मत्वा सारूपाणामित्येव शेष आरभ्यते ॥ Paśpas'ā

there were already developed two theories about 'पदार्थ' one asserting that the भावृति was the पदार्थ, and the other the द्रव. And Panini could not choose between the two and accepted both.

Seeing that so much work on the science of Grammar had been already done before Panini by so many Ācāryas, the question how far Panini is indebted to them naturally arises. This question in one of its important aspects viz. as to in what relation Panini stands to his predecessors as regards his technical devices,—has been admirably dealt with by Dr. Mangala Deva Shastri, M. A. Ph. D. in a very interesting paper read by him before the Fourth Oriental Conference.

The paper is divided into three parts. In the first part the doctor has shown that the Māheś'wara sūtras and the Pratyāhāras we get from them are pre Paninian, and that even the Pratyāhāras 'सप्' and 'तिद्' are really pre Paninian. He has also pointed out that the two Paribhāṣas "गतिकार-बोधयदाना दृष्टिं सह समामयन्तं प्राक् सङ्ग्रहणे" and "प्रिया गतानुबन्धेन निर्दिष्टं यद्गमैव च । यदेवावगच्छन् चैव पञ्चैतानि न यदद्वयं च" are universally proclaimed by the commentators to be पुराचार्यपरिभाषा. And he has proved that the terms सप्तमरण, दत्ता, भट्ट, कृदि, प्रणय, and टु which is the 1st. विकरण of the third conjugation, were also known before Panini.

In the second part he has shown that Panini was not the first grammarian to make the use of Anubandhas, and that in many cases the meaning of the Anubandhas now found in the Aṣṭ. is identical with that which was attached to them in earlier grammatical works

In the third part, the learned doctor goes on to show that almost all the *Akrtrima Sanjñās* used in the Aṣṭa. were also to be found in pre-Paninian works, and that the device of coining artificial Sanjñās was not wholly unknown to Panini's predecessors.

II

सर्ववेदपारिषदं द्विदं शास्त्रम्:— Keeping these facts in our mind, let us turn to the Aṣṭa. What do we find there? The Sanjñās laid down in the Aṣṭa. are not adhered to in the Aṣṭa. itself. There is no important Paribhāṣā which has not important exceptions, not a few, but many. There is no uniformity in the use of cases. The Veda as was pointed out by Whitney, is referred to as छन्दस्, मन्त्र and निगम promiscuously. And the notion of option is expressed with the words वा, उभयथा, अन्य-तरस्याम्, विभाषा and बहुलम् indiscriminately.

The last of these facts had struck Patanjali also, and under S. II. ii. 57 (पूर्वापरप्रथमचरणम्) & S. VI. iii. 14. (तत्पुरुषे इति बहुलम्) he gives an explanation of it in the words:—

अत्रद्वयं सन्वयस्यसाभिरीदं वक्तव्यम्—बहुलमन्यतरस्यामुभयथावैशेष्यामिति । सर्ववेदपारिषदं द्विदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थानुम् ॥

Here at last we have found the key to more than half the riddle of the Aṣṭa. The words वा, उभयथा, अन्यतरस्याम्, विभाषा, पन्थेयम्, and बहुलम् are used indiscriminately to express the notion of option, because, सर्ववेदपारिषदं द्विदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थानुम् । The Veda is promiscuously referred to as छन्दस्, मन्त्र, and निगम because, सर्ववेदपारिषदं द्विदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थानुम् । There is much irregularity in the use of cases because सर्ववेदपारिषदं द्विदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थानुम् । There is no important Paribhāṣā without important exceptions because सर्ववेदपारिषदं द्विदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थानुम् ।

And again, the Sanjñās laid down in the Aśtd. are departed from in the Aśtd itself, because—सर्ववेदपारिषद् हीदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः सक्य आभ्यानुम् ।-

The word पारिषद् is derived from the word परिषद् by adding the Taddhita affix अन्, according to S. पञ्चाश्वपुं परिषदश्च IV. iii. 123, in the sense of 'तस्येदम्', which may be roughly translated into English by 'belonging to'. Thus the word पारिषद् means, belonging to a परिषद् or school.* The word सर्ववेदपारिषद् therefore means 'belonging to all the Vedic schools'. So, Patanjali says, this expressing of the notion of 'option' by the use of various words वा etc., is due to the fact that the Pāṇinīya S'āstra does not belong to one school but to all the schools of all the Vedas, and the use of different words expressing 'option' in the Aśtd, is in keeping with the use of different words expressing option in the various Vedic schools. Thus Patanjali tells us that the Aśtd. is made up mainly of sūtras culled out from grammatical works, belonging to various schools of the Veda, and the irregularities in it are to be attributed to that fact.

We may also explain the word सर्ववेदपारिषद् as परिषदि जातं पारिषद्म् । सर्ववेदानां पारिषद् सर्ववेदपारिषद्म् । Thus the sentence 'सर्ववेदपारिषद् हीदं शास्त्रम्', means: This S'āstra originated in all the schools of all the Vedas. And what is the consequence of this? तत्र नैकः पन्थाः सक्य आभ्यानुम्, it is impossible to stick to any single way in the Aśtd, uniformity is impossible in the Aśtd. This means that the sūtras of which the Aśtd. is made up originated, not in any single school of any single Veda, but in all the schools of all the Vedas, and whatever irregularities we may come across in the Aśtd. are attributable to that fact.

* अभ्येनृतसंघः परिषद्. Kanyata on B. VI iii. 14.

We must remember that the Vyākaraṇa = one of the six Angas of the Veda. Like all sciences of ancient India, the Vyākaraṇa also originated in the Vedic schools, and it is interesting to note that the ऐतरेयब्राह्मण teaches the संहितोपासना.

This statement of Patanjali that the Pāṇinīya Śāstra is सर्ववैश्वारिष्य, and consists mainly of sūtras culled out from various sources is supported by the fact that we come across in it sūtras by at least three different philosopher grammarians one a नैयायिक, the second a सांख्य and the third a भाववादिन्. In the Aśtd there are four different words used to express what is in English expressed by the word 'substance': viz. 'अधिकरण' in S. V. iii. 43., 'वस्तु' in S. V. iv. 9, 'सत्त्व' in S. I. iv. 57., and 'द्रव्य' in S. V. iv. 11.* These four sūtras in which these four different words for 'substance' occur are not evidently by one author. If Panini had written all these four sūtras himself, why did he use four different words to convey a single notion, viz. that of 'substance'? Here it is evident that Panini borrowed verbatim at least three of the above sūtras from earlier Ācāryas. If we suppose that Panini used the word द्रव्य for 'substance', then he must have incorporated sūtras I. iv. 57, IV iii. 43. and V. iv. 9. into the Aśtd. from the works of three different grammarians belonging to different schools of thought. Thus S. IV. iii. 43. (अधिकरण विषये च), containing the word 'अधिकरण' meaning 'substance', was evidently borrowed from the work of a grammarian, who with the नैयायिकs, believed that the द्रव्य is different from the गुणs, that the द्रव्य is the अधिकरण of the गुणs, that the द्रव्य or substance is the place where the गुणs reside.¹ And S. V. iv. 9

* Vide foot note on p. 66.

1. Cf. गौतमन्यायसूत्र. II. ii. 66 व्यक्तिगुणविशेषाभयो मूर्तिः 1. Satyayana Bhāṣya — अयमवयव इति व्यक्तिगुणविशेषाभयो नि न मयं द्रव्यं इति ।

(जायन्ताच्छब्दधुनि) was evidently borrowed from a *grihastha* who with the Sāṅkhyas believed that the द्रव्य was nothing but a 'गुणानां बन्धु', a bundle of qualities.²

Some philosophers, of whom Vārāhyāyaṇi was the chief went beyond the categories of the Sāṅkhyas and the Naiyāyikas and arrived at the conception of 'भाव'. They thought that the प्रपञ्च and the पुनः of Sāṅkhyas and the ईश्वर, the परमात्मा &c. of the Naiyāyikas, were nothing but the various manifestations of the भाव; and that the भाव was the primal substance which manifests itself as the universe.³

यो गुणविशेषाणां स्वशोभतानां गुरुत्वपनस्य इत्यन्तर्गतं कारणमव्यापिनः परिमाण-
स्थामयो यथामन्मयं तद्वद्व्यं सृतिर्भेदित्वा यदवशादिति ॥

2 वक्तृत्वधैर्यं प्रकान्तिभिरेव प्रविशन्तु । स्वप्रत्ययादुकारेण शब्दार्थः प्रापि
भज्यते ॥ *Funyara's Commentary* तथा च वैशेषिकेणावयविनं प्रति-
पादयितुं षट्शब्दः प्रयुक्तः मांश्वैर्गुणसमाहारमात्रमभिधायने । *Vakyapadiya*.
Benares 1887. p. 138.

1 & 2 किं पुनर्द्रव्यम् ? किं पुनर्गुणाः ? शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धा गुणाः । ततोऽन्यद्
द्रव्यम् । किं पुनरन्यच्छब्दादिभ्यो द्रव्यमाहोतिरन्यत् ? गुणस्वार्थं भावाद्व द्रव्ये
शब्दनिर्देशं कृत्वा न्यपयत्यन्यच्छब्दादिभ्यो द्रव्यमिति ॥ अनन्यच्छब्दादिभ्यो
द्रव्यम् । नान्यदुपलभ्यते । पञ्चोः स्वस्ववि विवक्षितस्य पणंभते न्यस्तस्य नान्य-
च्छब्दादिभ्य उपलभ्यते ॥ अन्यच्छब्दादिभ्यो द्रव्यम् । तस्मिन्नुपलभ्यते ।.....
कोमात्रवृत्तानः ? ।..... यस्य गुणान्तरेष्वपि प्रादुर्भूतं तत्त्वं न विहन्यते तद्-
द्रव्यम् ।... ..नरथा—आत्मकादीनां कलानां रक्तारयः प्रतीतारयश्च गुणाः
प्रादुर्भवन्ति । आत्मार्कं वदरमित्येव भवति ॥ *Bhasya on B V. 1. 119*. तस्य
भावस्तत्तल्लो ।

द्रव्ये च भावः कः सम्प्रत्ययः ? यदि शाब्दं गुणसमूहयो द्रव्यम्..... ।
Bhasya ॥ IV. i 3. ग्रियाम्.

* इदानीं कारणत्वात्वा नीतिरुच्यते । त्रियाद्रव्ययोः स्वात्मन्धो विशेषः कार्या-
त्मप्रवृत्तयोः पुष्टोपभोगमन्ततोपक्षये कार्यात्मभावातीतो येन तमभावेन भवन-
मात्रमिभन्निना प्रलयात्तेवतिष्ठते सोऽन्यन्ताविनाशधर्मा आत्माभाव इत्युच्यते ।

This 'भाव' was divided into two categories—'पूर्वापरीभूत' and 'मूर्तः सत्त्वभूतः'. The first is expressed in language by verbs and the second by nouns.* Thus what the nouns express is भाव that has, as it were, become frozen (मूर्त). When the भाव becomes frozen or मूर्त it is called सत्त्व. This 'सत्त्व' is analogous to 'द्रव्य', and so the word सत्त्व became synonymous with the word द्रव्य. And we think that those sūtras in the Astā in which the word सत्त्व occurs in the sense of द्रव्य or substance are taken from grammarians who, with Vātsyāyana, held that this world of actions and forms is nothing but a manifestation of the भाव. This doctrine of भाव was evolved in the Vedāparivāts, Durga tells us that this doctrine was taught in the वेदवैयक्यानाम् †

These sūtras show that Pāṇini, whenever he borrowed sūtras from others' works, borrowed them verbatim, without troubling himself to change their wording; otherwise 'कथं', 'अधिकरण' and 'सत्त्व' in the sūtras considered above would have been changed to simple 'द्रव्य', which smacks of no particular school of philosophy.

भाह । कथमयमिह प्रसक्तः । शृणु । तद्विकारा एव हि द्रव्यगुणकर्मभावेनावस्थिताः सन्तो नामाख्यातोऽसमन्वितास्तैरभिधायन्ते स्थितिराद्ये ॥...भाह प्रधानमेतन्म्यान् । किं कारणम् । तद्वत्त्वेन द्योतयामाद्वन्तिष्ठते प्रत्ययकाल इत्येके मन्यन्ते । तत्र नैव । किं कारणम् । भावविकार एव हि सोऽपदसम्प्रदायस्यान्—प्रधानभाव इत्युच्यते । गुण्यन्तर्हि । तत्राप्ययमेव हेतुस्त्वुपार्थान्यादित्यान् ॥ एतेनैवैवत्परमाण्यादिभावविकाराः प्रत्युक्ताः । ईश्वरभावः परमाश्रुभाव इति सोऽपदस्यान् ॥ Durga on Nirukta Adhyaya I, Pada 1, Khanda 2.

* पूर्वापरीभूतं भावमाख्यानेनाद्ये भवति पञ्चनित्यपञ्चमप्रभृत्यपदगणयन्तम् । मूर्तं सत्त्वभूतं लघ्वनामभिः । Nirukta I. 1. 1.

† VId Nirukta. Anandasrama Edition (1921) p 28. वेदवैयक्यानाम् आद्यैर्मन्त्र तत्र इत्यनेनाद्यं निर्णयिते.

The use of the word परिमाण in the Aśtd is worth noting. In S. V. : 39 (गोद्वयचोर्मस्य्यापरिमाणाभादेयन्) both the words, परिमाण and संख्या occur, and it is evident that the word परिमाण does not include 'संख्या'. But = S. IV in. 156 (कृतिवत्यरिमाणात्) — संख्या परिमाणगृहणेन गगते, न ऋदिपरिमाणमिदं । (Kāś'ika). It is evident that the two sūtras come from two different mathematician-grammarians, who held different views about the nature of परिमाण.

Another circumstance that shows that the Aśtd. is made up of sūtras borrowed verbatim from various sources, and that in it नैव वन्धा. शक्यं आम्भ्यान् — is the occurrence in the Aśtd. of what the भाष्य calls 'मोत्रो निर्देशः', that is, the use of word-forms which are incorrect according to the Aśtd. This occurrence in the Aśtd. of non Aśtd. forms has called forth very scathing remarks from महद्गुमारिड. Says he —

मूत्रवार्तिकभाष्येषु दृश्यते चापगन्धनम् ।

अभाष्या कथं शास्त्रान् विस्मरेणु मचेतना ॥

मूत्रे नावज्जनिकर्तुं प्रकृतिरित्यत्र द्वावपशब्दौ । अनिशब्देन हि इन्द्रियो चातुर्निर्देशे इत्यनेन उद्वेगनान्वितौ चातुरेय निर्दिश्यते । न च तस्य कर्तुं प्रकृते अपादानसंज्ञाप्यते । आयमानस्य पुनरर्थस्य अनिशब्दो वाचकतया नैव उद्वेगे-
मातुगत । तेनार्थ इतिद्व इवाश्वशब्दः अनिवात्राचित्वात् तदर्थं प्रत्यक्षाधुरेय विहा-
यते ॥ तथा नृजकाम्या कर्तर्गीति प्रतिविद्वपशोमनासप्रयोगादुभ्याकरणक-
परित्यागः । एवं तत्प्रयोजक इति प्रतिषिद्ध एव समाप्त ॥

That the later commentators have somehow or other proved or tried to prove, that the word जनिवर्तु is a correct Aśtd form† does not entitle us to think that nowhere in the Aśtd., the rider has forgotten the horse on which he is riding.

† तन्त्रवार्तिक under S. 24 in अ०. I. पा मी अ० ४ मीमांसादर्शने. Vol. I. p. 259 Anandasrama Edition.

† Vide Tattirabodhini on I. 4. 30. जनिवर्तुं प्रकृति-

In many sūtras word-forms occur which can in no way be shown to be supported by the Astā, and which the best of commentators are compelled to pass over as quickly as possible, making the short remark सौत्रो निर्देशः.

तियंच्यपवर्गे । III iv. 60.

भाष्यम्:—अपुत्तोऽयं निर्देशः । तिरक्षीति भवितव्यम् । सौत्रो निर्देशः ॥
अन्वच्यावुलोम्ये । III, iv. 64.

भाष्यम्:—अपुत्तोऽयं निर्देशः । अन्वचीति भवितव्यम् । सौत्रोऽयं निर्देशः ॥
उदिष्पधिषलेर्दम् V. i. 13. समाहारद्वन्द्वे सौत्रं पुंस्त्वम् ।

Bālaṃanoramā & Tattvabodh.

तदर्धं विदृतेः प्रवृत्तौ । V. i. 12. “तदर्धमिति सामान्ये नपुंसकं व्यत्ययेन सप्तमीस्थाने प्रथमा । Tattvabodhini.

अनेन तदर्धमित्यत्र सुष्यत्ययेन सप्तम्यास्थाने प्रथमा, लिङ्गव्यत्ययेन च स्त्रीलिङ्गस्य स्थाने नपुंसकलिङ्गं कृतमिति दर्शयति । ननु च चन्द्रमि व्यत्यय उक्त । नेदं छन्द । तत्कृतौ व्यत्ययः । छन्दोऽस्मन्प्राणि भवन्तीत्यशेषः ।

Nṛ̥ṣa.

पुषोरनाशौ । VII : 1.

समाहारद्वन्द्वे ध्रुव इति प्राप्नोति । इत्येतत्तयोर्गो सु युद्धोरिति । तत्र सौत्रस्या-
निर्देशस्य ह्रस्वमृन्मोक्षारलोपं वा कृत्वा निर्देश इति न दोषः । Kaiyata.

मलीयः प्रातिपदिवान्तस्य । VIII. 2. 7.

प्रातिपदिकग्रहणमतमन्तमेव सुपां सुगिति पठ्या लुको (sic) निर्दिष्टम् ।
पदस्येति वर्तते । प्रातिपदिकस्य पदस्य योत्यः Kāś'ikā.

This difficulty about the विशेषणविशेष्यमात्र between 'पदस्य' and 'प्रातिपदिक' shows that the sūtra was not originally under the 'पदस्य' domain or अधिकार, and that it was put under it from somewhere else. प्रातिपदिकान्तस्य is an adjective to the word 'न' in 'नलोपः'. Therefore मलोपः is an अवयवार्थसामान, साधेयम-
समर्थं भवति । Therefore 'नलोपः' is a compound not allowed by the अशाध्यायी (Cf. B. समर्थः पदविधिः II. i. 1.). Bhattoji tries to

get over this difficulty by imagining that नलोपः is not a compound word, but that 'न' and 'लोपः' are two distinct पद, 'न' being equal to नस्य, with the genitive termination elided. In either case we do not get over the difficulty of non-Āstā-dhyāyī forms, if नलोपः is a compound, there is the असमर्थममाम which is not allowed (cf. Tattvabodhini: पूर्वपदेनावेष्टत्वेन समामा-सम्पन्नात्), if न=नस्य, then also we can explain it only by saying नेति छुन्नपदविं पदं सौमन्वात् (Tattva), which is also not quite satisfactory.

The difficulty about the असमर्थसमाम is felt also in S छिद. सलोपोऽनन्त्यस्य Cf. Tattva नेति छुन्नपदविं ननस्यस्येत्यनेन विवेच्यते ।

Another circumstance that proves irrefutably that whenever Panini borrowed sūtras from another system, he borrowed them verbatim, without making the slightest change, is the occurrence in the अष्टाध्यायी of sūtras which teach the formation of words with affixes which have इत् which are quite useless in the अष्टाध्यायी system. For instance let us take the sūtra लोहिनादिहाग्न्य. क्यप् III. 2. 13 Patanjali in his Bhāṣya on this sūtra has shown that both the इत् in the affix क्यप् viz, क् and क्, are useless and serve absolutely no purpose*. Here it is evident that S लोहिना was borrowed from a system where both क् & क् in the affix क्यप् had some meaning. Nay, this is not all. There occur some sūtras in the अष्टाध्यायी in which the affixes have इत् which go against the system of the Āstā. इत् in their operation. The three well known sūtras औद आपः (VII. 1. 18) आदि चाप (VII. iii 105) and आग्ने नात्रियाम् (VII. 3. 120) are an instance in point. Let us consider the first of these three sūtras —

*Cf. Kaṣyapa:—यदीति । अनेन क्कारः प्रत्याग्यात । इहानीं पकार-प्रत्याग्यानाय विचारं विधेते ।

औद् आपः । VII । 18

कागिकाः—आनन्ताद्गादुत्तरस्यौद् शीत्यममादेशो भवति, सद्दे परम् ।
वदुराजे । कारीरगन्धे ।

“औद्, coming after a stern ending in आप् is changed to शी”. Thus we get राद्वा+औ=सद्दे. Now let us turn to the Bbhāṣya on the sūtra.

विषयो इकारः । सामान्यग्रहणार्थः । औद् इत्युच्यमाने प्रथमाद्विचनस्यैव स्यात् । अथाप्यौद्दिप्पुच्यते । एवमपि द्वितीयाद्विचनस्यैव स्यात् । अस्ति प्रयोजनमेतद् । किं तर्हि । इत्स्वार्थं तु प्राप्नोति । राद्दे माते । याद्वा इति याद् प्राप्नोति । नैव दोषः । नैवं विज्ञायते इकार इत्यस्य सार्थं द्वित् द्वितीति । कथं तर्हि ? इकार एव द्वित् द्वितीति । एवं तर्हि वर्णग्रहणमिदं भवति । वर्णग्रहणे तु चैतद् भवति यस्मिन्विहितरादाजन्मग्रहण इति न दांशो भवति ॥ अथवा वर्णग्रहणमिदं भवति । न चैतद् वर्णग्रहणे तु भवति ‘अनुबन्धग्रहणे न मानुबन्धकम्येति’ ॥ अथवा पूर्वम्वनिर्देशोयम् । पूर्वम्वनेषु येऽनुबन्धा न तैरिहेत्कार्याणि विद्यन्ते ॥

भौकारोयं शीरिषो द्विदृष्टीतो द्विचास्माकं नास्मि कार्यं प्रकारः ।

सामान्यार्पणस्तस्य चासङ्गनेऽस्मिन् द्वित्कार्यं ते दयां प्रसक्तं स दोषः ॥ १ ॥

द्वित्वे विषाद्वर्णनिर्देशमात्रं वर्णे यत्स्यात्तच्च विषात्तरादौ ।

वर्णभार्यं तेन द्वित्वे न दोषो निर्देशोयं पूर्वम्वनेषु वा स्यात् ॥ २ ॥

It will be seen that Patanjali gives here three explanations of the strange रु; in the first explanation, he takes the position that the sūtra is by Panini himself and that औद् is used in the sūtra as a प्रत्यय; and proceeds to explain away the याद् difficulty by taking the compound द्वित् in S. धेहिनि as a सत्पुण्य and not as a सद्पुण्यहि. This explanation not satisfying* him, he hazards a second, and says that औद् in the sūtra is not used as a प्रत्यय, but as a letter pure and simple † This explanation also was felt by him as he not

* सर्वस्याप्याविश्याना द्वयमेव प्रयोजनम् ।

पूर्वम्वनितोषो वा विषयस्यातिरेकः वा ॥

† Contravenes the qv. 110.

प्रत्ययप्रत्यययोः प्रत्ययस्य ग्रहणम् ।

satisfactory, and so he offers a third and, it is submitted, the correct explanation viz. that the sūtra has been borrowed verbatim from earlier works. That this third explanation is the correct one and that Panini did borrow from others sūtras verbatim, can be seen by comparing S आदि चाप (VII 3 105) and आदौ नास्मियाम् (VII 3 120) with the present sūtra. The first of these has not at all been commented upon by Patanjali and though he has commented upon the second one, he has unfortunately not considered whence this आद्, strange to the Paninian system comes. The Siddhānta Kaumudī on "आदौ नास्मिया" definitely says 'आदिति टाभेन प्राचाम्,' and the Kāśikā commenting upon S VII.iii 105 (आदि चापः) says "आदिति पूर्वाचार्यनिर्देशेन तृतीयैक्यचनं गृह्यते "

If it was anywhere imperatively necessary for Panini to translate sūtras borrowed from the works of grammarians of other schools, it was in these three instances. He has not done so Does this circumstance not entitle us to conclude that Panini, whenever he borrowed sūtras from others borrowed them verbatim without troubling himself to make changes in them so as to conform with his own system?

Bhāradvāja is one of the grammarians named by Panini in the अष्टाध्यायी. To some sūtras now found in the अष्टाध्यायी भारद्वाजीय Vārtikas are attached and are quoted by Patanjali. Is it that such sūtras are borrowed by Panini from Bhāradvāja?

Thus we see that the Aśtd. contains sūtras borrowed verbatim from various sources and incorporated into it. It is सर्वेदपारिषदम्, and therefore, तत्र नैव पन्था शक्य आम्भानुम्.

Now let us turn to the problems of the Pāṇinīya (Chapter VIII) and see whether we can solve any of them.

III (7) The Veda is promiscuously referred to as छन्दस्, मन्त्र, and निगम, in the Aṣṭa, and the notion of option is expressed by as many as five words— वा, उभयथा, अन्यतरस्याम्, विभाषा and बहुलम्.

Solution :— सर्ववेदपरिपदं हीदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम् । This S'āstra originated and exists, not in one particular school of one particular Vēda, but in all the schools of all the Vedas. This S'āstra contains sūtras, borrowed verbatim from various sources and incorporated into it. Therefore there is bound to be variety in the use of words नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम् ।

(6) The निपातनमन्त्रा intervene abruptly in the middle of sūtras expressed in the regular analytic form

Solution — सर्ववेदपरिपदं हीदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम् ।

(5) There is much irregularity in the use of cases in the Aṣṭa.

Solution — सर्ववेदपरिपदं हीदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्. The Aṣṭa is built up of sūtras drawn from various sources; and the irregularity, or rather the variety, in the use of cases is due to that fact तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम्.

(4) There occur in the Aṣṭa, some sūtras which, taken singly or together with a preceding or following sūtra, fall into metre.

Solution — सर्ववेदपरिपदं हीदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम् । The metrical sūtras were probably borrowed and incorporated into the Aṣṭa, from metrical grammatical works like the Rkprāṇis'ākhya.

(3) The Aṣṭa is not uniform in its use of technical terms or Sanjñās.

Solution - सर्ववेदपरिषद् द्विद शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैव पन्था शक्य आम्हानुम् । न शक्यमेका सग्रामास्थातुम् । It is impossible to stick to any particular term to express any particular idea or thing, because the Astā sūtras come from various sources.

(2 b) Many Paribhāṣas 'प्राचीनवैयाकरणतन्त्रे वाचनिका', though not expressly laid down in the Astā., are nevertheless applicable to it because they are in the words of Nagojibhatta पाणिनीयतन्त्रे आपकन्यापसिद्धा

Solution — सर्ववेदपरिषद् द्विद शास्त्रम् । Portions from the works of प्राचीनवैयाकरणस have gone towards the making up of the Astā, and therefore the paribhāṣas which were 'वाचनिका' in their तन्त्र, are also applicable generally speaking to the Astā.

(2 a) All the important paribhāṣas found in the Astā have numerous important exceptions in the Astā, itself.

Solution — सर्ववेदपरिषद् द्विद शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैव पन्था शक्य आम्हानुम् । The Astā contains sūtras from various earlier grammatical works. These earlier grammatical works had their own paribhāṣas, which sometimes differed from the paribhāṣas to be met with in the Astā. The sūtras of the earlier grammatical works naturally accorded to the paribhāṣas which were to be found in those earlier grammatical works and when some of the sūtras of the earlier grammatical works were taken verbatim into the Astā, naturally they formed exceptions to the Astā paribhāṣas.

But the matter does not end here. We seem to have arrived at an earlier grammatical work forming the basis of the Astā. For evidently the fact that there are some paribhāṣas found in the Astā entitles us to expect that a book of sūtras which was written strictly according to the paribhāṣas now to be met with in the Astā, lies hidden in the Astā.

And this is supported by the fact that the *Mandūkya* the *चानुवृत्त्योत्तरवाचवर्तन*, and the purposeless *Yogavibhaga* seem to indicate sutras added later to an already existing book of sutras

III

THE BASIS OF THE ASTA.

Now let us take the following six sutras and consider them carefully. A thorough understanding of their significance will throw much light on how *Patanjali* worked on the construction of the *Asta*

जनपदे लुप् ॥ IV. ॥ 81

Āsaka — देशे तन्नास्तीति यथानुरधिकं प्रत्ययो भवति, तस्य देशविशेष जनपदेऽभिधेये लुम्भवति । ग्रामसमुदायाः जनपद । पञ्चालानां निवामी जनपद पञ्चाला । कुरु । मत्स्या । अङ्गा । वङ्गा । मगधा । सुखा । पुण्ड्रा ।

वरणादिभ्यश्च ॥ IV ॥ 82

Kaśika — वरण इत्येवमादिभ्य इत्यत्रभ्य चातुरार्थेकस्य प्रत्ययस्य लुम्भवति । अजनपदार्थ आरम्भ । वरणानामदूरभव नगर वरणा । etc

एवि युक्तवद्व्यक्तिवचने । I ॥ 31

Panini proceeds to refute this last sutra (I ii 51) which is that of his पूर्वोच्यैः †

तदग्न्य मज्ञाप्रमाणत्वान् ॥ I ii 53

Kaśika — तदिति प्रकृत युक्तवद्भाष्येण निदिश्यते । तद् अग्न्ये न वक्तव्यम् । कस्मान् ? मज्ञाप्रमाणत्वान् । मज्ञाप्रमाणं हि नानादिगमस्या प्रमाणं पञ्चाङ्गा वरणा इति । नैत योगप्रमाणं । किं तर्हि ? अनपदेशीना मज्ञा एता । तत्र लिङ्गं वचनं च मन्त्रादभिद्वयं न यत्नप्रतिपाद्यम् । यथा आपो दारा वृहा सिक्ता इति ॥

Panini having thus refuted S I ii 51 which is a sutra of his predecessors, proceeds now to refute the sutras that enjoin *lup* elision like S अनपदे लुप्, on which S I. ii. 51 (लुपि युक्तवद्भाष्येति च) depends * and which also must therefore be पूर्वोच्यैः मन्त्रैः —

लु-योगाप्रग्यानान् । I. ii 54.

Kaśika — लुप्यग्न्ये । योऽयं अनपदे लुप्, वरणादिभ्यश्चेति लुप्यने भयं न वक्तव्यम् । किं कारणं योगाप्रग्यानान् । नहि पञ्चाङ्गा वरणा इति योगसर्वस्य प्रग्यायत । नैतदुपलभामह ऋष्ययोगाप्रग्ये वरणा इति । किं तर्हि मज्ञा एता । तस्मादत्र तस्य निवासोद्दिष्टमवधेति तद्विधौ नैवोक्तम् । किं लुप् रिपानेन ।

योगप्रमाणे च तदभावे अदर्थं स्यात् । I ii. 55

Kaśika — पञ्चाङ्गाद्य मज्ञाप्रमाणं न योगनिमित्तं इत्युक्तम् । तच्चाप्य-मैवाभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । योगप्रमाणे हि तदभावेऽदर्थं स्यात् । यदि पञ्चाङ्गादिभ्यो यागस्य प्रमाणं यागस्य वाच्यं स्यात् तन्मन्त्रभावेऽदर्थं नमप्रमाणं स्यात् । नृदपने च सम्प्रति विनैत्र धृत्रियमन्त्रेण अनपदेशु पञ्चाङ्गादिभ्यः । ततोऽगम्याय नार्थयोगनिमित्तम् । किं तर्हि ऋषिपुण्ये तत्र प्रकृतं इति ॥

The *hās'ika* tells us that I ii. 51. is a पूर्वोच्यैः मन्त्रैः borrowed by Panini. And the tenor of the *hās'ika* on I. ii. 53, 54 and 55, clearly shows that sutras अनपदे लुप् and वरणादिभ्यश्च &c

† तदनन्पूर्वोच्यैः पाणिनि प्रग्याचष्टे ।

Balamanoorana on I ii. 53

* Cf. उपनिषद् प्रत्यायासोपनीत्य प्रत्याचष्ट—पुष्ट्योगानि ॥ Taittiri.

And this is supported by the fact that the *Mandūkya* and the *Yogavibhaga* seem to include sutras added later to an already existing book of sutras.

III

THE BASIS OF THE AṢṬA

Now let us take the following six sutras and consider them carefully. A thorough understanding of their significance will throw much light on how Pāṇini worked on the construction of the Aṣṭa.

जनपदे ण् IV. ॥ 81

Ṭasika — दश सत्रास्तीति यथातुराधिकं प्रत्ययो भवति, तस्य दशविंशये जनपदेऽभिधये लुप्भवति । ग्रामसंज्ञया जनपद । पञ्चाक्षरा निशासी जनपद पञ्चाक्षरा । कुरव । मत्स्या । अङ्गा । वङ्गा । मगधा । सुखा । पुण्ड्रा ।

वरणादिभ्यश्च IV ॥ 82

Ṭasika — वरण इत्येजमादिभ्य इत्यस्य चातुराधिकस्य प्रत्ययस्य लुप्भवति । अजनपदार्थे आरम्भ । वरणानामदूरभव नगर वरणा । etc

लुपि पुक्तवद् व्यक्तिवचने । I ॥ 81

Ṭasika — लुपीति लुप्तमया लुप्तस्य प्रत्ययस्यार्थ उच्यते ॥ तत्र लुपि पुक्तवद् व्यक्तिवचने भवत । पुक्तवदिति निशाप्रत्ययेन चवतुना प्रहृत्य च्यत । स हि प्रत्ययार्थमात्मना युनाति । तस्य पुक्तवतो व्यक्तिवचन लुप्तये विधायत । अथवा पुक्त प्रकृत्यर्थे प्रत्ययार्थेन सम्बद्ध । तस्मिन्निव व्यक्तिवचने लुप्तये भवत । व्यक्तिवचन इति च लिङ्गसंज्ञया पूर्वाचायनिर्देश । तदाद्यमेवेद मन्त्रम् । तथा चास्य प्रत्याख्यान मविष्यति । तदसिष्य सञ्ज्ञाप्रमाणत्वादिति । व्याक्ति श्रीपुनपुस्तकानि । वचनमवत्त्वद्वित्वबहुत्वानि ॥ पञ्चाक्षरा ध्वनिया शुद्धिया । बहुवचनविषया । तेषां निवासा जनपद । यथा तेषु सत्रिवेषु व्यक्तिवचन तद्वजनपद भवत । पञ्चाक्षरा, कुरव । लुपिति किं ? लुपि मा भूत् । लवण रूप । लवणा यवाय । लवण शकम् ॥

* Note the difference between लुप् and लुक्

Pāṇini proceeds to refute this last sūtra (I n 51) which is that of his pūrvācārya †

तदगिष्य मज्ञाप्रमाणत्वान् ॥ I ॥ 53

Hasika — तदिति प्रवृत्त युक्तवद्भासलक्षण निर्दिष्टत्वे । तद् अगिष्य न वक्तव्यम् । कस्मान् ? मज्ञाप्रमाणत्वान् । मज्ञात्वादिति वाचादिमन्त्राया प्रमाण पञ्चाद्या वरणा इति । नैत यागाद्वदा । किं तर्हि ? अनपदादीनामज्ञा एता । तत्र लिङ्ग वचन च सम्भावमिदमेव न यत्नप्रतिपाद्यम् । यथा आपा दास गृहा भिक्षता इति ॥

Pāṇini having thus refuted S I n 51 which is a sūtra of his predecessors proceeds now to refute the sūtras that enjoin *ḥ* in the S *अनपदे* *ḥ* on which S I n 51 (*ह्रस्वि युक्तवद् व्यक्तित्वेन*) depends * and which also must therefore be pūrvācārya *ḥ* —

ह्रस्वयोगाप्रमत्यानाम् । I ॥ 54

Hasika — ह्रस्वयोगिष्य । वा र्व अनपद-उद्, उरणादिभ्योने ह्रस्वने अय न उत्तम्य । किं कारण योगाप्रमत्यानाम् । नहि पञ्चाद्या वरणा इति याग मन्त्रे प्रत्यापन । नैतदुपलभामह श्रुयोगान्तरे उरणा इति । किं तर्हि मज्ञा एता । तस्मादत्र तन्वनिगमाद्दूरभास इति तद्धिता नैराख्यन । किं ह्रस्वा विधानना यागप्रमाणे च तदभावे अदर्शन म्यान् । I ॥ 55

Hasika — पञ्चाद्या मज्ञाप्रमत्या न यागनिमित्ता इत्युच्यम् । तत्रात्रय मन्त्राद्युपगन्तव्यम् । यागप्रमाण हि तदभावेऽदर्शन म्यान् । यदि पञ्चादादिगन्ता यागस्य प्रमाण यागस्य प्राचय म्यान् तन्मन्त्रमात्रेऽदर्शनमप्रयाग म्यान् । ह्रस्वने च मन्त्रे निमित्तं ध्रुविमन्त्रेऽयन अनपदं पञ्चादिशब्द । तन्मात्रमायन नार्थ यागनिमित्तक । किं तर्हि कश्चिदर्थेन तत्र प्रष्टव्य इति ॥

The *hasika* tells us that I n 51 is a pūrvācārya *ḥ* borrowed by Pāṇini. And the tenor of the *hasika* on I n 53, 54 and 55, clearly shows that sūtras *अनपदे* *ḥ* and *वरणादिभ्यो* are a

† तदन्तर्याम्यस्यैव पाणिनि प्रत्याचष्ट ।

Salamanorana on I n 53

* Cf. उवाच इह प्रत्याग्यापयतीत्य उवाच — ह्रस्वयोगि न Taitirab.

also sūtras by Paṇini's पूर्वार्चयः. This is also the opinion of the Hāṭmanoramā. But the author of the तत्त्वबोधिनी says that S. लुपि युक्तवद्ध्यत्तिवचने is written by Paṇini himself 'पूर्वाचार्यानुरोधेन'.* But this is, we submit, erroneous. The Kāś'ikā expressly tells us that S. लुपि युक्तवद्ध्यत्तिवचने is a पूर्वार्चयःसूत्र, and in the face of this we cannot give credit to the opinion of the तत्त्वबोधिनी that the sūtra is पूर्वार्चयानुलोकेन कृतम्. The Kāś'ikā is undoubtedly a far greater authority than the तत्त्वबोधिनी. Moreover, we have seen above that Paṇini has incorporated into his work the sūtras औऽ आप, 'आरो वास्त्रियम्' and 'भाषि आप' from the works of earlier आचार्यः without troubling himself to transform them according to his own terminology, and if it was anywhere absolutely necessary for Paṇini to recast his sūtras borrowed from others, it was here. If Paṇini has not cared to recast sūtras which he borrowed with assent, it is extremely unlikely that he should restate in his own language the sūtras of पूर्वार्चयः which he proposes to refute, when refuting another's opinion it is necessary for one to state that other's opinion in that other's own words.

Let us dwell a little longer on the explanation given by the author of the Tattwabodhinī. He introduces the sūtra 'तदशिव्य संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात्' with the note पूर्वार्चयानुलोकेन कृतं सूत्रं सम्प्रति प्रत्याचष्ट. And next he introduces the sūtra लुप्योगाप्रख्यानात् with the words 'उपजीवक प्रत्याख्यायोपनिर्णय प्रत्याचष्टे'. Here the sūtra 'लुपियुक्तवद्ध्यत्तिवचने' is the उपजीवन and the sūtra 'जनपदे लुप्' the उपजीव्य. So if the उपजीवक sūtra is composed by Paṇini पूर्वार्चयानुलोकेन, then the उपजीव्य also must have been composed by him पूर्वार्चयानुलोकेन. Now, it is to be noted that S. लुप्योगाप्रख्यानात् is I. ii. 54 and जनपदे लुप्, IV. ii. 81. Thus the तत्त्वबोधिनी would have us believe either, that Paṇini

* पूर्वार्चयानुलोकेन कृतं सूत्रं सम्प्रति प्रत्याचष्टे

wrote IV. 11. 81 first, and then proceeded to refute it by I. 11. 54, which is ridiculous or that Panini having told us that **हृप्** is **अशिष्ट** or not to be taught in the first अध्याय proceeds himself to teach it (**हृप्**) by the sūtra **जनपदे हृप्** in the fourth अध्याय which also is obviously impossible. The explanation given by the **कामिनी** and the **वाल्मीकीय** does not give rise to such absurdities. What actually happened was that Panini found the sūtras '**हृपि युक्तवद् व्यतिवचने**' and '**जनपदे हृप्**' in their respective places, i. e. one in a former and the other in a subsequent chapter of a book that already existed in his time and took that book as the basis of his work and turned it into the present अध्यायी, by revising and enlarging it with sūtras mostly borrowed from other sources. This book which served Panini as the basis of his work, we submit was the work of his own '**आचार्यः**' to whom he refers in his अध्यायी

It is to be noted that the sūtras '**जनपदे हृप्**' and '**हृप्योगा प्रख्यानात्**' show that between two sūtras of the अध्यायी, there might be in some cases an interval of several centuries. The sūtra '**जनपदे हृप्**' must evidently have been written at a time when the connexion between the countries and the warrior tribes from whom they (countries) got their names was living, but at the time of Panini, who wrote **हृप्योगा प्रख्यानात्**, evidently the connexion between the warrior tribes and the countries named after them was severed (cf. **दृश्यते च सम्प्रति विनैव क्षत्रियसम्बन्धेन जनपदेषु पंचालादिभ्यः** Kāś'ikā). For such vast changes in the residences of the क्षत्रिय tribes to take place it must evidently have taken several centuries.

We have seen that '**वरणादिभ्यश्च**' is a पूर्वोच्चारणम्. Then evidently the **वरणादिगण** also is not by Panini but by the author of the sūtra **वरणादिभ्यश्च**. Thus Panini in this case is

indebted for both the गण and the sūtra pertaining to it to his "पूर्वाचार्यः".

The दुष् ought not to be taught, says Panini. Therefore, it follows, all of the sūtras teaching 'दुष्' are not by Panini.

We are now in a position to formulate a hypothesis, which will rationally explain all the problems of the Pāṇinīva.

Panini got handed down to him as Upadeś'a from his Acaryas a book of sūtras which conformed to the Paribhasas now found in the Aṣṭd., with the Dhatupatha and the Ganapatha as companion volumes to that book of sūtras. The book of sūtras, Panini found, was incomplete and inadequate as a manual of Sanskrit Grammar. So he proceeded to enlarge it

1. mainly by incorporating into it sūtras borrowed from grammatical works belonging to schools of grammar other than his own, which sūtras can be detected by the fact that they generally contravene the Paribhasas found in the Aṣṭd., and
2. by framing, wherever necessary, fresh sūtras of his own and adding them to it (i.e. the original book of sūtras got from his Acaryas); which sūtras are detectable by the fact that, though they conform to the Paribhasas found in the Aṣṭd., yet are indicated to be later additions by the three tests of the Mandukapūṭī, the चानुवृत्त्योक्तवानुवृत्ति, and the purposeless Yogavibhaga.

In this way did Panini give us a सर्वदेसादिपदं शास्त्रम्, in which मेवः पन्थाः शक्य आम्नातुम्.

If we take out all the sūtras added by Panini, whether of his own authorship or borrowed from works of schools other

than his own we shall arrive approximately at the original book of sūtras which was got by Panini from his Ācāryas, and which formed the basis of his Aṣṭādhyāyī. This we shall call The Basic Book of Sūtras.

Let us turn to Chapter VIII. There we read — The Dhātupāṭha does not seem to be by the author of the Aṣṭ but seems to be the work of a predecessor of his. But never, theless the system of roots and the arrangement of roots in the Dhātupāṭha clearly shows that the author of the Dhātupāṭha knew very many sūtras now found in the Aṣṭ, and so arranged the roots in the Dh. P. as to serve the purposes of those sūtras.

Solution — All such sūtras which seem to have guided the author of the Dhātupāṭha in his composition of the Dhātupāṭha were contained in the Basic Book of Sūtras. We think that the author of the Basic Book of Sūtras is the same as the author of the Dhātupāṭha. This Ācārya who wrote the Basic Book of Sūtras seems to have held, with Śākatāyana and the Nairuktas that the नामानि were आख्यातनानि, and so wrote his Dhātupāṭha as to serve a double purpose—that of the student of grammar and also that of the student of words on the lines laid down in the Nirukta (vide p. 10).

Similar is the case with the Ganapāṭha. The whole of the Ganapāṭha is the work of Panini's Ācāryas and the sūtras for which the various Ganas were written are also the work of Panini's Ācāryas. The sūtras were a part of the Basic Book of Sūtras.

This Basic Book of Sūtras seems to have been mainly divided into two parts — one dealing with the roots with the Dh. P. attached to it, the other dealing with nouns with the

Ganapātha attached to it. This is supported by the fact that, as shown by Dr. Mangala Deva Shastri, the pratyayas तिप्, झप् and झट्, and the pratyābhara तिद्, are pre Paninian. Evidently, the pratyaya तिप् and the pratyābhara तिद् presuppose what is now P. III. iv. 78 (तिप्तम्). Thus S. III. iv. 78 (तिप्तम्) must be pre Paninian. We think that S. II. iv. 78 formed part of the Basic Book of Sūtras on which the Aṣṭa is built.

We think that the part dealing with roots and the Dh. P. in the Basic Book of Sūtras began with the sūtra भूवादयो घातवः, which is now P. I. iii. 1. The sūtra tells us what the words contained in the Dh. P. are, it says they are roots or Dhātus. So it is the sūtra to stand at the beginning of that part of the Basic Book of Sūtras, which treated of the roots.

Strangely enough this is supported by the anomalous व् in S. भूवादयो घातवः.* The one explanation given by the Vārtika kārā unhesitatingly of this 'व्' is that it is there as an invocation for auspiciousness or Mangala भूवादीनां वकारोऽयं मंगलार्थं मपुष्यते. But in S. I. i. 1. the author of the Aṣṭa, has already had his मङ्गल, by writing 'इदिरादैश्' instead of 'आदैर्इदि'. Now, why is there another मङ्गल in I. iii. 1? Patañjali says (I. iii. 1) मङ्गलादीनि मङ्गलमभ्यानि मङ्गलान्तानि च शाखाणि प्रथन्ते। But it is to be noted the मध्यमङ्गल is very rarely, if at all, found. And Patañjali himself speaks under S. I. i. 1. of only the आदिमङ्गल and not at all of the मध्यमङ्गल†. Even if we accept Patañjali's dictum under S. I. iii. 1 that there ought to be a मङ्गल in the मध्य or middle of a work, evidently I. iii. 1. is in no sense the मध्य or the middle of the Aṣṭa. It is rather its

* Cf. Bhasya—इतोऽयं वकारः ? इदित्तरात्महितया निर्देशं त्रियत् भूवादय इति भवितव्यम्। अप्यात्महितया न् आदय इति भवितव्यम् ॥ I. iii. 1.

† मङ्गलादीनि हि शाखाणि प्रथन्ते etc. Bhasya on S. I. i. 1.

the Aṣṭa dealing with the declension of nouns and the Taddhita affixes is really the work of Panini's Ācāryas and formed part of the Basic Book of Sūtras

Here we seem to have arrived at rather a very startling conclusion. The Dhāsupāṭha is not by Panini but by his Ācāryas. The same is the case with the Gaṇipāṭha. And in the Aṣṭa itself only those sūtras can be definitely ascribed to Panini which, though they do not go against the Paribhāṣas found in the Aṣṭa yet can be shown to be additions by Panini by the three tests of the Mandūkapiṭṭi, the चातुर्दृश्योत्तरवाच्यता, and the purposeless Yogavibhāga. Such sūtras form only a negligible minority in the Aṣṭa. Then why call the Aṣṭa system of grammar the Pāṇinīya at all? Why? Because—answer Patañjali and Vāmanas and Jayāditya—it is पाणिनिना प्रोक्तम् । न तु कृतम् ।

भाष्यम् — पाणिनिना प्रोक्तं पाणिनीयम् । Paspas'ā

तेन प्रोक्तम् ॥ ११. iii 101

वातिवम् — प्रोक्तग्रहणमनर्थकं तत्रादर्शनात् ॥

भाष्यम् — प्रोक्तग्रहणमनर्थकम् । किं कारणम् । तत्रादर्शनात् । यामि यामि काल्पयन् काठकं च प्रोच्यत तत्रादर्शनात् । न च तत्र प्रत्ययो दृश्यते ॥

वातिवम् — ग्रन्थे च दर्शनात् ॥

भाष्यम् — यत्र च दृश्यते ग्रन्थे न भवति । तत्र कृते ग्रन्थे इत्येव सिद्धम् ॥ छन्दोर्थं तर्हीद वक्तव्यम् । न हि छन्दांसि विद्यन्ते । विद्यानि छन्दांसि ॥

वातिवम् — छन्दोर्धामिति चेन्नृण्यम् ।

भाष्यम् — छन्दोर्धामिति चेन्नृण्यमेतद्व्यति । यामि यामि काठकं काल्पयन् च प्रोच्यते । तत्रादर्शनात् । न च तत्र प्रत्ययो दृश्यते । ग्रन्थे दर्शनात् । यत्र दृश्यते ग्रन्थे न भवति । तत्र कृते ग्रन्थे इत्येव सिद्धम् ॥ ननु चोक्तम् । न हि छन्दांसि विद्यन्ते । विद्यानि छन्दांसि । यद्यप्यर्थो निगमः । यास्वती दर्शनार्थं साधितम् । तदेवाच्यते । काठकम् । काल्पयन् । योदकम् । वेदनादक-

मिति ॥ न तर्हीदानीमिदं वक्तव्यम् । वक्तव्यं च । किं प्रयोजनम् ? । यत्तेन प्रोक्तं न च तेन कृतम् । माधुरी वृत्तिः ॥ यदि तर्ही अयम् निवन्धनमस्ति । इदमेव वक्तव्यम् । तत्र वक्तव्यम् । तदप्यवश्यं वक्तव्यम् । यत्तेन कृतं न च तेन प्रोक्तम् । वाररचं काव्यम् । जालुवाः श्लोकाः ॥

तेन प्रोक्तम् ॥ IV. iii. 10

Kaṣka:—तेनेति तृतीयासमर्थान् प्रोक्तमित्येतस्मिन्नर्थे यथाविहितं प्रत्ययौ भवति । प्रकर्षेणोक्तं प्रोक्तमित्युच्यते, न तु कृतम् । कृते ग्रन्थ इत्यनेन गतत्वात् । अन्येन कृता माधुरेण प्रोक्ता माधुरी वृत्तिः । पाणिनीयम् । आपिशलम् । काशकृत्स्नम् ॥

And it is because the vast majority of sūtras in the Aśtd. are not by himself but by his predecessors, that Panini refers to the Sūtrapāṭha as उपदेश.

उपदेशोऽमनुनासिक इत् ॥ I. iii 2.

Kaṣka—उपदिश्यतेऽनेनेत्युपदेशः शास्त्रवाक्यानि मूलपाठः खिलपाठश्च ॥

quickened the scientific study of the Aśtā.† Moreover, a plagiarist discovers a book written by an ancient author, which is lost to the world, and palms it off as his own work. The Aśtādhyāyī was in no sense lost to the world in Candra's time. It was studied all over India. Then, why did Candra take the Aśtā, and recast some sūtras in it and make some slight innovations in its arrangement and offer it to the world as the Cāndra Vyākaraṇa? Why did no Candra write an entirely new work? Candra saw that the Aśtā sūtras were studied from hoary antiquity. Generations after generations of students had committed them to memory and philosophers and litterateurs had conducted their grammatico philosophical discussions on the basis of the Aśtā sūtras. Commentators had quoted them in their commentaries. And now, if Candra had written sūtras altogether new, the students of Candra would have been unable to understand grammatical discussions based on the Aśtā sūtras, and to that extent would have been cut off from the main philosophical and literary currents. So what Candra did was to take bodily sūtras from Pāṇini, making only a few necessary changes, so that a student of Candra can easily understand, generally speaking, all grammatical references to and discussions based upon the Aśtā sūtras. Similar, it seems, were the considerations that weighed with Pāṇini. He wanted to give us a manual of grammar which would be exhaustive and comprehensive. He found that his own Ācāryas had handed down to him a

† य पतञ्जलिशिष्योऽथो अष्टौ व्याकरणानामः ।

काठे स दाक्षिणात्येषु ग्रन्थमात्रे व्यवस्थितः ॥ 488 ॥

पर्यन्तादात्म्यं लब्ध्वा भाष्यवीजानुसारीभिः ।

स नीतो बहुशतत्वं चन्द्राचार्यादेभिः पुनः ॥ 489 ॥

Vakya-padiya Kanda II

system of grammar, however incomplete and defective. He also found works as those of Āpiś'alt having great authority and currency among the people. Under these circumstances if Panini had given his generation an entirely new work, his generation would not have accepted him. Therefore Panini took the system of grammar that was handed down to him from his Ācāryas for the basis of his work and developed it into the present Pāṇinīya.

Fortunately for us the Vārttikas which are attached to the sūtras of the Aṣṭd and which are attributed to Kātyāyana, are an illustration in point. Nagaji is clearly of opinion that the Vārttikas are not all of them by one author. *Of. Uddyota* न च वचनेत्यस्यापि वार्तिकस्याद्वातिवृत्तास्तीत्यवचसः कथं प्रमाणत्वेनाभयमिति भाष्ये वार्तिकस्यायमुपपद्यमिति वाच्यम् । अन्योऽपि वार्तिककारः वार्तिकान्तरं यतश्चन प्रमाणान्तरत्वेनाभयतीत्यदोषान् ।† And Kielborn has shown that the Vārttikas now attributed to Kātyāyana are not all of them his work, there were more than one Vārttikakāras. Thus says Kielhorn the prose Vārttikas are by an author different from that of the S'loka-vārttikas because some S'loka vārttikas are directed against prose Vārttikas, others try to improve upon them, and yet others intend to explain them. Kātyāyana was thus the last great Vārttikakāra who collected together all the Vārttikas by his predecessors with some additions of his own. Similar was the case with Panini. He was

* तत्र ये साधवस्ते ज्ञानिणानुशिष्यन्ते । अमापुम्यो विविधा ग्रहणिप्राय यविभागेन ज्ञाप्यन्ते । इमे साधव इति । कथं पुनरिदमाचार्येण पाणिनिनामगते मेने साधव इति ? । आपिशलेन पूर्वव्याकरणेन । आपिशलिना तदि केनामगम् ? तत पूर्वोक्त व्याकरणेन ।

Padamanjari

† On Bhasya on Vārttikas सुप्रामादयतेषु च, on S समर्थं पदविधि,

the last great Sūtrakāra of the school to which he belonged and he built up his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* mainly out of sutras from his predecessors. Thus Pāṇini did not wipe out of existence the works of his predecessors by his *Aṣṭ*, but preserved them in it.

Pāṇini's work — Now, it may be asked, was Pāṇini simply a *Pravakir*? and if he was a mere *Pravakir* how is it that his name has eclipsed all other names in the field of grammar? He has eclipsed all other grammarians, first, because he was the first grammarian to try to give us a comprehensive सत्र-वैदपारिपद, book on grammar. Secondly, it was he who disentangled grammar from other things with which it seems to have been mixed up before his time. He laid down that grammar had nothing to do with how a word gives a particular meaning, because as to the meaning, it is the usage among the *Śiṣṭas* that determines it and not grammar.* A second change which Pāṇini effected was to do away with the काशविकार, which was to be found in earlier grammatical works and adopt a new arrangement,† and the most ingenious part of this new arrangement is the division of the *Aṣṭ* by means of S. VIII. 1. 1. (पूर्वत्राविदम्) into the नपादमत्ताप्यायी and the त्रिपादी.

* Vide S. I. 1. 56 (प्रज्ञानप्रत्ययाप्यैः) and the *Āṣṭika* thereon.

† पाणिनीयप्रज्ञानमहात्म्ये व्याकरणम् ।

Candrabhūti II 2. 68.

अज्ञानेयः । IV. 11. 115

Āṣṭika — पाणिनिप्रज्ञानमहात्म्ये व्याकरणम् ।

Cf also. न वै काशविकारोऽस्ति । *Bhāṣya* on S. पराये लिट् III. 1.

PART II

ANALYSIS OF THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ

CHAPTER XI

PRINCIPLES OF ANALYSIS OF THE AṢṬĀ

Every sūtra in the Aṣṭā is *prima facie* to be considered to have formed part of the Basic Book of Sūtras unless *

It can be shown to have been incorporated into the Aṣṭā by Panini from the work of another school by the fact that it contravenes the Paribhāṣas found in the Aṣṭā

or

It can be shown to have been framed by Panini himself and added to the Basic Book of Sūtras by means of the three tests of the Mandūkyaśloka: the चतुष्टयस्योत्तरावृत्ति, and the purposeless Yoga vibhāga

(Vide p 114)

The above are the principles that should guide us broadly speaking in our analysis of the Aṣṭā. But it should be remembered that every sūtra should be considered independently and with respect to its context. Only after that can we definitely say whether it was part of the Basic Book of Sūtras or an addition by Panini to it in building up his सर्ववेदपरिषद् शास्त्रम्

CHAPTER XII. ANALYSIS OF III :

प्रत्ययः । 1.

परश्च । 2.

Ḍaśaḥ—चकारः पुनरस्यैव मनुष्यायुषः । तेनोगादिषु परस्व न
विज्ञप्यते ॥

आनुदात्तश्च । 3

अनुदात्तौ सुप्रितौ । 4

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| { | <p>गृप्तिर्द्भ्य सन् । 5</p> <p>मान्बपदान्मान्भ्यो द्विचंभ्यासम् । 6</p> <p>धातोः कर्मणः समानकर्मणादिच्ञायां वा । 7.</p> <p>सुप आत्मनः कयच् । 8.</p> <p>काम्यश्च । 9</p> <p>उपमानादाच्चादे । 10.</p> | } |
|---|--|---|

Note the पञ्चमी in all the sutras from 5 to 10 for the प्रत्ययविधि C/ also तुदादिभ्यः ञः, तनादिर्द्भ्य उः, जयादिभ्यः भा, etc. That the proper vibhakti for the प्रत्ययविधि is the पञ्चमी is clear from S यस्मान् प्रत्ययविधिभिनदादि प्रत्ययेद्गम्. We have emphasised on this point here, because we shall later come across some sutras, which have a षष्ठी for the प्रत्ययविधि. It is evident that they were incorporated by Panini into the *Aṣṭa* from grammatical works belonging to schools other than his own. The proper function of the षष्ठी is given in the *Bhāṣya* on S I. 1. 1. षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्यादेशो उच्यन्ते ॥ आगमा अवि षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्योच्यन्ते । द्विगेन च । *Bhāṣya* on III. I. 21, says : षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टं विज्ञागममयुक्तं भवति । पञ्चमीनिर्दिष्टाश्च प्रत्ययो विधीयन्ते ।

Sutras 8 to 10. We have shown above (pp. 67-73) that S. 'काम्यश्च' is a later insertion in between SS. 8 and 9. It is an addition by Panini.

दयमानादाचारे । 10.

कृत्तुः क्यद्मलोपश्च । 11.

'च' not अनुवृत्त्यर्थः. 'अन्वाचयसिद्धः सलोपः'. माप्यम्.

भृगादिभ्यो मृग्यच्चेत्लोपश्च इटः ॥ 12.

'च' not अनुवृत्त्यर्थः. 'अन्वाचयसिद्धो इटो लोपः'. माप्यम्
लोहितादिहाम्य क्यप् । 13.

कृषाय कर्मणे । 14.

Sutra 13 is highly suspicious. Its position is anomalous, because in the following sutra viz. S. 14, there is the क्यप्-इति and not क्यपवृत्ति. But क्यद् ought to retire at S. 13, just as क्यप् retires at S. 11. This shows that S. 13, is a later insertion. In the Basic Book of Sutrās, S. 14 came immediately after S. 12. The sutra लोहिता^० seems to have been borrowed by Panini from another system and inserted in between the sutras 12 and 14.

Another thing to note about this sutra is that, as shown by Patanjali (p. 105), both the इत् in क्यप्, viz. क् and प् are useless in the Paninian system. This shows that the sutra was borrowed by Panini from a system where both क् and प् had some meaning.

सत्यादराद्यस्पर्शान्मृग्यच्चेत्लोपश्च कर्मणं कृण्वरादिभ्यो णिप् । 25

1. From the sutra it is evident that 'वर्ण' and 'वृण' were not to be found in the कृण्वरादिगण. Now, both of them are found in it

2. Why are the कृण्वरि roots mentioned along with प्रातिपदिकs like रूप, वीणा, वृद्ध etc. in one and the same sutra? Is it that the author of the sutra thought that the कृण्वरि were more of प्रातिपदिकs than of वाचुs? It should be noted that Yaska regards the कृण्वरि as वाचुs.

कृतेरीयङ् । 29.

It should be noted here that कृति is a sūtra root, not mentioned in the Dhātupāṭha. The sūtra does not contravene any Paribhāṣā found in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Therefore this sūtra is framed by Paṇini himself and is later than the Dhātupāṭha.

कषेणिङ् । 30.

Root कश्चु is according to the Dh. P. a भ्वादि. Therefore it would take णच् according to the Dh. P. The author of the Aṣṭd says that root कश्चु takes णिङ् and not णच्, therefore this sūtra is post-Dh. P. This sūtra is an addition by Paṇini to the Basic Book of Sūtras.

कास्प्रत्ययादामन्त्रे लिटि । 35

इजार्धे गुरुपतोऽनृचः । 36.

दयायासश्च । 37.

1. By the च in S. 36, आम् is inducted into it from S. 35. But 'आम्' proceeds to S. 37. Here the Paribhāṣā 'चाङ् नोत्तरं' is broken.

2. Now let us consider the Yogavibhāga between S. 36 and S. 37. Sūtra 36 is a general rule, sūtra 37 mentions three particular roots which take आम्, thus S. 36 is a general rule whereas S. 37 is a particular rule. Therefore the Yogavibhāga between the two can be attributed to that fact. Why is there Yogavibhāga between S. 35 and S. 36? The portion 'प्रत्ययादामन्त्रे लिटि' of S. 35 is a general rule, S. 36 also is a general rule, therefore there is Yogavibhāga between them. Now let us see why there is Yogavibhāga between S. 35 and S. 37. It may be said that the portion 'प्रत्ययादामन्त्रे लिटि', of S. 35, is a general rule, and S. दयायासश्च a particular rule therefore there is Yogavibhāga. But the word वाम्, in S. 35 is to be noted. If root वाम् can be mentioned in S. 35, there is no reason why

the three roots दृ, अ, and आम् should not also be put in S. 35 along with क्, thus.— दृष्यान्नाम्प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे ङिति. If it was desired to separate the general and the particular rules, then the author of the sutras ought to have written:—

प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे ङिति ।

इतिदेशं गुरुमतो नृच्छः ।

दृष्यान्नाम् ।

There is no reason why क् should be put in S. 35 and why दृ, अ, and आम् should be put in S. 37.

Our explanation of all the facts is that the Basic Book of Sūtras contained only S. 35 and S. 36. And as both of these are general rules having a broad application they were given separately in two sūtras. Now there remained only the root क्. The author of the Basic Book of Sūtras did not think it proper to allot one whole sūtra for the one root क्. Therefore he put it in S. 35, along with the general rule प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे ङिति; thus giving us the sūtra 'क्प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे ङिति'. Panini found that the three roots दृ, अ, and आम् also take आम्. Therefore he framed S. दृष्यान्नाम् and added it as the third sūtra.

Cf. Candra'—

अनेकाच्चा ङित्ताम्भ्यन्निङिच्चात् ।

इतिदेशं गुरुमतो नृच्छोऽर्थः ।

क्प्रत्ययादामम् ॥

दृष्यान्नाम्भ्योऽन्यतरस्याम् । 38.

भाष्यम्.— भाट्टाजीवाः पठन्ति: 'विदेशम् विज्ञापननाम्ना अगुणत्वम् ।

Is the sūtra borrowed from Bhāradvāja ?

मीर्द्धाद्गुणः द्रुवच । 39

'पञ्चमीनिदिष्टाश्च प्रत्ययो विधीयते । Patanjali on S. III. 1. 1. But here पञ्चमीनिदिष्टाश्च प्रत्ययो विधीयते. ∴ The sūtra borrowed by Panini from another system.

वा वाचस्पत्यानप्रमुक्तमुद्रमुद्रमिदुटिलयः ॥ 70.

Sutra 70, an addition by Panini. Vide p 16. et seq.

म्वादिभ्यः इतुः । 73.

श्रुवः श्रु च । 74.

Nyasa:— श्रु श्रवण इति म्वादी पठ्यते । ततः श्रुपि प्राप्ते श्रुविधीयते ।

Sutra 74 added by Panini. Of our remarks on 'सिन्धि-
हृण्योर च' on pp. 18-19.

अधोऽन्यतरस्याम् । 75.

Added by Panini. Remarks same as on S वा वाचस्पत्यानप्रमु०,
mutatis mutandis. Vide pp. 16 17

तनादिहृण्य डः । 79

The text of the sutra indicates that originally 'हृण्' was
not among the तनादिः. Kāśāśvāmin has a 'हृण्' among the
म्वादिः.

सिन्धिहृण्योर च । 80.

Addition by Panini. Vide pp. 18 19.

स्तम्भुस्तुम्भुः स्तम्भुस्तुम्भुः स्तम्भुस्तुम्भुः । 82.

'आपाधत्वारो घानवः सौमाः' (Kāś'ikā) Vide our remarks on
the sutra roots in Chapter II (pp. 19-21). Remarks similar
to those made on S. वा वाचस्पत्यानप्रमु० on pp. 16 et seq. apply
to this sutra also. The sutra (82) is an addition by Panini.

न दुहस्तुनमां यक्चिणौ । 89.

(1) भाष्यम्:— भारद्वाजीयाः पठन्ति यक्चिणोः प्रतिषेधे निश्चिण्यन्धि-
श्रुतात्मेनेपदाकर्मकाणां प्रसङ्गान्निति ॥

(2) 'पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठी' in 'दुहस्तुनमाम्' ।

(3) "दुहेरेनेन यक् प्रतिषिध्यते । चिण् दुहेरेति पूर्वमेव विभाषितः ।
Kāś'ikā. "दुहेरेनेन यक् एव निषेधः । चिण् तु विकल्पेनेप्यने" Sid-
dhānta Kaumudī. But this contravenes the rule 'विप्रतिषेधे परं
कार्यम्'.

The *sutra* borrowed by Panini from another system ; probably from *Bhāṣavyāja*. If Panini himself had written this rule, he would have written:—

न द्विो यक् ।

स्तनमश्रिप् च ॥

कुपिरजोः प्राचां इयन् परस्मैपदं च । 90.

कुपिरजोः—पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठी । ∴ Borrowed by Panini from another system. This conclusion supported by 'प्राचाम्'.

Candra has 'कुपिरज आप्ये'.

कृत्वाः । 95. Siddhānta Kaumudī.

कृत्वाः प्राङ्पुलः । 95. Kāś'ikā.

अचो यत् । 97.

पोरदुपधात् । 98. [यत्]

शक्तिसहोश्च । 99 [यत्]

गदमदचरणमध्यानुपसर्गे ॥ 100. [यत्]

1. Note that 'यत्' inducted into S. 99 with a 'च' proceeds to S. 100. Contravenes 'आनुकृष्टं नोत्तरञ्च'. ∴ Either S. 99 or S. 100 an addition.

2. 'शक्तिसहोः'—पञ्चम्यर्थे षष्ठी. ∴ Incorporated by Panini from another system.

Therefore we may conclude that the Basic Book of *Sūtras* had only:—

अचो यत् ।

पोरदुपधात् ।

गदमदचरणमध्यानुपसर्गे ।

and that Panini added "शक्तिसहोश्च" from another system. He did not add it after S. गदमद०, because 'अनुपसर्गे' would have been 'अनुकृष्ट' into it.

गदमदचरयमशानुपमगं । 100.

{ अशानुपमयययां गदमदचरयमशानुपमगं । 101.

{ वदं चरणम् । 102.

{ अयं म्यामिदययोः । 103.

{ उपमयां चान्या प्रज्ञने । 104.

{ अशानुपमं संगतम् । 105

वदः छपि कयप् च । 106. *

Kaśika — अनुपमगं इति वदते ।

Sūtras 101-105 are Nipātana sūtras. The intimate connection between S. 100 and S. 106 is clear from the Kāś'ikā. SS. 101-5 seem to be insertions by Panini.

वदः छपि कयप् च । 106.

Kaśika कयप् प्रत्ययो भवति चकारायम् ।

सुतो भावे । 107.

Kaśika :— भवतेः... ..कयप् प्रत्ययो भवति । यत्तु नादुवर्तते ।

Nyasa :— यत्तु नादुवर्तते इति । पूर्वशब्दे चादुवृत्त्वान् ॥

एतिशुनाम्बुदृष्टुः कयप् । 109

अनुपमभावाद्बुद्धिः । 110.

The 'च' in S. 110 shows that the कयप् adbhikāra ends with S. 110. SS. 111 to 123 seem to be additions. Of these S. 120, 'विभाषादृष्टयोः,' has a पञ्चम्यर्थे वशी. ∴ The sūtra is borrowed by Panini from another system. It should be noted that the Yogavibhāga between S. 113 (सुतेविभाषा) and S. 120 (विभाषा दृष्टयोः) is purposeless.

It should also be noted that SS. 118-120 come abruptly into the middle of Nipātanas. The 'च' in S. 'युयं च पदे' seems to indicate that the कयप् Nipātanas are finished there. This is borne out by the fact that the next Nipātana is of प्यत् (vide Kāś'ikā on S. 122. अमात्रम्यदन्यतरम्याम्).

अदृष्टोऽप्यन् । 124

ओग्वश्यके । 125 [ण्यत्]

आसुयुवपिरपिलपिचमथ । 126. [ण्यत्]

The 'च' in 3. 126 shows that the Anuvṛtti, of ण्यत् is finished with 3. 126. In 3. 124 ऋहलोर्ण्यत्, there is "पञ्चम्यर्थे पठि" (Kās'ikā) ∴ 3. 124, borrowed from another system. SS. 125 and 126 seem to be likewise borrowals, because SS. 124-126 are one group of sūtras all about ण्यत्.

आनाप्योऽनित्ये । 127.

The Nipātana sūtras begin from here and end at चित्प्राप्तिनित्ये च । 132.

The 'च' shows that the Nipātanas end here.

अनुपगांश्चिन्विन्दवारिणारिवेमुदेजिचेतिमातिसाहिभ्यथ । 138.

The sūtra contains 'साति', a sūtra root. ∴ The sūtra is post-D. P. The sūtra is framed by Panini and added to the Basic Book of Sūtras.

इदतिदधात्योर्विभाषा । 139.

पञ्चम्यर्थे पठि. ∴ The sūtra borrowed from another system by Panini and added.

उवलितिकसन्तैभ्यो णः । 140.

इवाययामुसंख्यतीणवसाहलिहलिपथसथ । 141.

The 'च' marks the end of the 'णविधि'. ∴ The next sūtra is an addition. This is supported by the fact that in

इन्योरनुपसर्गे । 142 [णः]

we have a 'पञ्चम्यर्थे पठि', which shows that the sūtra is borrowed by Panini from another system.

आशिषि च । 150.

इति तृतीयायायस्य प्रथमः पादः

॥ इति सर्वं शिवम् ॥



* पञ्चम्यर्थे पठिति ।.....प्रत्ययविधौ हि परथेति (III. 1. 2.) सम्भवात् पञ्चम्या भाष्यम् ॥ Nyāsa.